

This monograph, compiled at the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement with the participation of prominent figures in the present-day world communist movement, shows the impact of Lenin's ideas on the world revolutionary working-class movement. It deals with the principles underlying the Leninist strategy and tactics of the revolutionary working-class movement, the unity of the advanced forces of the international working class on the foundation of Leninism, and the development and achievements of the world communist movement. Attention is focussed mainly on the present stage of the working-class struggle, chiefly on the struggle for the unity of the proletariat and all other anti-imperialist forces.

ACADEMY OF SCIENCES OF THE
USSR

Institute of the International
Working-Class Movement,
Scientific Council
for the Study
of the Working-Class
and the Mass Democratic
Movements

Russian text edited by:
Y. Kuskov, A. Rumyantsev
and T. Timofeyev

LENINISM AND THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT



*Problems
of the Struggle
for the Unity
of the Proletariat,
of
All Anti-Imperialist
Forces*



PROGRESS PUBLISHERS
MOSCOW

Translated from the Russian
by *David Skvirsky* and *Yuri Sdobnikov*
Designed by *Yuri Kopylov*

ЛЕНИНИЗМ
И МИРОВОЕ РЕВОЛЮЦИОННОЕ
РАБОЧЕЕ ДВИЖЕНИЕ

На английском языке

First printing 1971

Printed in the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

CONTENTS

Page

FOREWORD	7
--------------------	---

PART ONE.

LENINISM—BANNER OF OUR AGE

Leninism and the Revolutionary Remaking of the World. By M. A. Suslov, Member of the Political Bureau, CC CPSU, Secretary of the CC CPSU	13
Leninism—Continuation and Development of Marxism Under New Historical Conditions	14
Leninist Line of the CPSU	24
International Character of Leninism	34
Leninism Is Winning the World	39

The Heritage of Lenin and Problems of the Revolutionary Working-Class Movement. By Waldeck Rochet, General Secretary, French Communist Party	50
---	----

Leninism and the Building of the Developed Socialist Social System. By Walter Ulbricht, First Secretary, Central Committee, Socialist Unity Party of Germany	84
---	----

The Struggle Against Imperialism—the Common Task of the Communists and All Revolutionary Forces. By Gus Hall, General Secretary, Communist Party of the United States of America	111
---	-----

PART TWO.

THE WORKING CLASS IN THE VAN OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY MOVEMENT

I. Leninist Concept of the World Revolutionary Process and the Bankruptcy of Its "Critics"	127
II. Strategy of the World Communist Movement	153

Steps Taken by Lenin to Unite the International Revolutionary Working-Class Movement on the Basis of Proletarian Internationalism	153
Strategy and Tactics of the Marxist-Leninist Parties in the Struggle Against Fascism	198
Leninism and the Consolidation of the United Anti-Imperialist Front	233
III. The Victorious Working Class and the Building of the New Society	268
Historic Mission of the Proletarian Dictatorship	271
Consolidation of World Socialism	285
IV. The Working Class—the Leading Force of the Anti-Monopoly Struggle in the Citadels of Imperialism	303
Tendencies in the Proletariat's Development	310
Changes in the Mass Working-Class Movement	330
The Working Class and the General Democratic Movements Under Present-Day State-Monopoly Capitalism	361
V. The Working Class of the Developing Countries	382
VI. Leninism and the Historical Fallacy of Right and "Left" Opportunism	400
The Crisis of Social-Reformism and Problems in the Struggle for the Unity of the Working-Class Movement	401
Against Minimising the Historical Mission of the Working Class	429
Proletarian Internationalism, the Basis for Stronger Cohesion of the World Revolutionary Working-Class Movement	469
Conclusion	485

FOREWORD

This book shows how Leninism influences the development of the international working class, and deals mainly with the Leninist principles underlying the struggle to strengthen and unite the revolutionary proletarian movement and rally all the world's anti-imperialist forces under the leadership of the working class and its communist vanguard. The Russian edition was published on the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, who founded the first proletarian Party of a new type, inspired and led history's first victorious socialist revolution, and created the Soviet state. Brilliant theoretician and strategist of the world working-class and the entire anti-imperialist movement, he profoundly expressed the basic interests and aspirations of the working people of the whole world.

Lenin's theoretical and practical work was devoted to the struggle for the bright ideals of the revolutionary proletariat and the interests of the working masses. Lenin's name is indissolubly associated with the epochal achievements of the international army of labour, with the establishment of the new, socialist system in a considerable part of the globe and with the rise and growth of the modern international communist movement. *An exhaustive study of Lenin's vast heritage enables one to understand the laws governing the class struggle of the world proletariat, the trends and prospects of the activity of the proletarian mass organisations and the allies of the working class, and the ways and forms in which the world-wide revolutionary liberation process develops.*

One of the cardinal tasks of Marxist-Leninist science is to study and sum up the experience of the international working-class movement. Leninism has always stressed that for class-conscious workers it is exceedingly important "to have an *understanding of the significance* of their movement and a *thorough knowledge* of it".* Lenin repeatedly made the point that class-conscious workers had to promote broad international contacts both on the practical and theoretical levels in order to be well-informed "on the forms and theories of the world revolutionary movement".**

Problems linked with the assessment of the role played by the working class in the world-wide historical process have not accidentally returned to the limelight in the ideological and political struggle at the present stage, which witnesses an aggravation of the collision between imperialism and the world forces of socialism. This is due to a number of factors, the chief of which are the growing influence of the international working class and its creation—the socialist system—on all aspects of social life and the redoubled attempts of the adversaries of scientific socialism to distort the Marxist-Leninist teaching about the historic mission of the working class and to show that this teaching cannot be applied to present-day conditions. Trends of this kind come to the fore in various forms. They emanate from Right-revisionist and some Left-extremist ideologists, whose preachings in many cases converge or even dovetail. This has found expression in, for example, the malevolent theory of the "degeneration" of the revolutionary working-class movement, of the "de-proletarianisation" of the working class and its "integration" with "neo-capitalist" society.

In other words, present-day bourgeois reformists and the petty-bourgeois pseudo-revolutionary ideologists are offering their own interpretation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching on the leading role of the working class.

Marxists-Leninists are in duty bound to give an argued rebuff to these anti-scientific concepts, whose purpose is to confuse the working class and all other progressive, anti-imperialist forces. This rebuff becomes convincing and effective if it is based on an opportune and pro-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 363.

** Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 26.

found Leninist analysis of the processes and new phenomena influencing the socio-economic position of the proletariat and defining its political make-up, consciousness and the main direction and prospects of its class struggle.

Research in this sphere has been substantially extended in recent years in the USSR and other countries. New research centres studying the international working-class and the revolutionary liberation movements have sprung up, and many fundamental works on this problem have been published. Today, as the CC CPSU stressed in its decision, adopted at the plenary meeting in June 1969, on the results of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, every effort must be made to "promote comprehensive research into contemporary problems and the general laws and specifics of the world revolutionary movement, formulate the key theoretical problems of the building of socialism and communism and step up the struggle of the communist and working-class movement against imperialism". Measures have been taken to further the study of pressing problems of the class and anti-imperialist struggle. In particular, in order to stimulate a broader and more comprehensive study of the role played by the working class and its allies in the anti-imperialist, democratic movements at the present stage of world social development, the Presidium of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR has recently set up a Scientific Council to organise and co-ordinate research into problems relating to the position of the proletariat and to co-operation between the working-class and mass democratic movements, ascertain the trends of the class struggle in the light of the modern scientific and technological revolution, analyse the socio-economic and political problems facing the organisations of workers by hand and by brain, and further their alliance in the joint anti-imperialist struggle. One of the principal aims of the scientists, whose work is co-ordinated by the Scientific Council, is to produce fundamental works summing up the vast experience that has been accumulated by the world-wide army of labour and generalising the laws and lessons of the class struggle of the proletariat and its revolutionary vanguard and the trends of the working-class movement in different countries and regions of the world.

These fundamental works are to be brought out in a series under the general heading *International Working Class*.

The first monograph in this series is the present volume, which is a collective work by authors from different countries, who responded to the request of the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement, Academy of Sciences of the USSR, to contribute to this publication.

The authors have patterned the monograph mainly on the problem and not the chronological principle in order to focus attention on a number of basic problems of the world revolutionary movement and single out from the wealth of the Lenin heritage and collective Marxist-Leninist thought those aspects which provide the key to understanding the present-day problems of the struggle to achieve proletarian unity and strengthen the world anti-imperialist front. They show the unfading significance of Lenin's ideas, give a rebuff to the latest Right-revisionist and Left-opportunist belittlement of the historic mission of the international working class and their distortions of scientific communism, and expose all sorts of pseudo-scientific concepts of social development.

A study of any aspect of Lenin's immense heritage reveals the internationalist character of Leninism and its vital significance to the world communist and working-class movement. This has been re-emphasised at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties. In the Meeting's Address *Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin* it is stated: "The acknowledged leader of the world working class, Lenin saw in the proletariat the leading force able to carry out the historic task of overthrowing capitalism and bringing about the socialist transformation of society. It was he who evolved the theory of the alliance between the working class and peasantry. Upholding unity of the working-class movement, Lenin was irreconcilably opposed to opportunism in all its forms. . . .

"It is under the banner of Leninism that the revolutionary movement in most countries has risen to a new height, Communist Parties have been formed and have grown strong, and the international communist movement has become a truly world-wide political force, the most influential political force of today."^{*}

^{*} *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, Prague, 1969, p. 40.*

PART ONE

**LENINISM—BANNER
OF OUR AGE**

LENINISM AND THE REVOLUTIONARY REMAKING OF THE WORLD

*By M. A. SUSLOV,
Member of the Political Bureau, CC CPSU,
Secretary of the CC CPSU*

There are red-letter days which are marked in all countries and by all peoples. One of them was April 22, 1970, the centenary of the birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin, brilliant thinker, theoretician of scientific communism, ardent revolutionary and great leader of the Soviet people, the international working class and the working people of the whole world.

This centenary was marked in a situation witnessing the spread of Lenin's ideas throughout the world. Modern history and all major revolutionary events of the 20th century, the most important of which—the October Revolution—rang in a new epoch in the life of mankind, the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism and communism, are indissolubly associated with Lenin's name and with his ideas and work. At this turning point of world history towers the gigantic figure of Lenin, showing people the road to a new life, genuine freedom, social justice, peace and universal prosperity.

Lenin did not live long—only 54 years. But it was a life of titanic activity, a life of dedicated struggle for the weal of people. He devoted his genius and all his energy to the struggle for the happiness of the working people and the progress of mankind. The name of Lenin and his ideas and work will outlive the ages and millennia.

LENINISM—CONTINUATION AND DEVELOPMENT OF MARXISM UNDER NEW HISTORICAL CONDITIONS

Lenin's name is closely associated with the names of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels, great leaders of the international proletariat. In Lenin Marxism had its most outstanding champion. He was an erudite, firm and consistent Marxist and a great continuer of the teaching of Marx and Engels. He was tireless in propagating the ideas of scientific socialism formulated by them. More than anybody else he realised that Marxism was giving the working class the knowledge that it needed to secure the triumph of its just cause. "Without knowledge," he wrote, "the workers are defenceless, with knowledge they are a force!"* Time and again he pointed out that Marxism, which has generalised and absorbed the entire experience of the international revolutionary movement, gives the working class a lucid idea of the aims, tasks and organisation of their struggle.

Far-reaching changes took place in world social development after the death of Marx and Engels, founders of scientific communism and teachers and leaders of the international proletariat. Capitalism entered its imperialist stage, and the problem of mankind's transition to socialism rose to its full stature. The revolutionary movement of the international proletariat acquired new experience of struggle. All this required a thorough scientific analysis, a strictly objective study and theoretical generalisation. To Lenin fell the difficult task of upholding and creatively developing Marxism in the new historical conditions, a task that was vital to the destiny of mankind.

He bared the significance of Marxism, showing that it was the only true revolutionary theory which sprang from the sum total of human knowledge, conformed its conclusions to the development of objective material reality and tested these conclusions in socio-historical practice. All the components of Marxism—philosophy, political economy and scientific communism—were enlarged on, developed and concretised in Lenin's works and practical activity.

Lenin was not an armchair scientist. He developed Marxist theory in the course of the proletariat's class battles, regarding it as a guide to revolutionary action and uphold-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, p. 92.

ing its purity against distortion, falsification and forgery. Lenin and the Communist Party founded by him had to wage an uncompromising struggle against numerous adversaries to safeguard the Marxist line and character of the revolutionary movement. The Narodniks (Populists), "legal Marxists", Economists, Mensheviks, Socialist-Revolutionaries, Trotskyites,* anarchists, Right-opportunists, national-

* *Narodniks*—representatives of a petty-bourgeois trend in the Russian revolutionary movement, which arose in the sixties and seventies of the 19th century. They denied that capitalist relations and a proletariat were bound to develop in Russia, and considered the peasantry to be the main revolutionary force. In the eighties and nineties Narodism became a reactionary liberal trend which stood in the way of the massive revolutionary-democratic struggle against tsarism and hindered the political development of the working class.

"*Legal Marxists*"—representatives of a socio-political trend in the nineties of the 19th century among Russian liberal bourgeois intelligentsia. They were preaching their views under cover of Marxism in legal newspapers and magazines; hence their name of "legal Marxists". They revised almost all the basic postulates of Marxism, discarding its most important feature—the theory of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Economists—representatives of an opportunist trend in Russian Social-Democracy at the turn of the century. The Economists restricted the tasks of the working class to the economic struggle, asserting that political struggle was the business of the liberal bourgeoisie.

Mensheviks—representatives of an opportunist, anti-Marxist-Leninist trend in the Russian Social-Democratic movement. It took shape at the Second Congress of the RSDLP (1903) and was expounded by all the adversaries of the newspaper *Iskra*, which was headed by Lenin. At the elections to the Party's central organs during the Congress, the Leninists received the majority of the votes and were, therefore, called Bolsheviks, while the opportunists found themselves in the minority and were called Mensheviks.

Socialist-Revolutionaries—members of a petty-bourgeois party formed in Russia in 1902. Championing the rural and urban petty bourgeoisie and relying on the support of the kulaks, the Socialist-Revolutionaries linked old Narodnik dogmas with individual Marxist tenets, which they revised and distorted. They maintained that individual acts of terrorism were the basic tactical means of struggle and, thereby, inflicted enormous harm on the revolutionary movement in Russia. The Socialist-Revolutionary Party disintegrated and ceased to exist at the close of 1920.

Trotskyites—representatives of a trend hostile to Marxism-Leninism in the working-class movement. It was called after L. D. Trotsky (1879-1940). The Trotskyites were opposed to Leninism as soon as Bolshevism emerged as an ideological trend. They rejected the dictatorship of the proletariat and held that socialism could not be built in the USSR. On that basis they formed an anti-Party opposition bloc. The Trotskyite opposition found no support whatever in the working-class movement. In 1929 Trotsky was exiled.

deviationists and revisionists of all hues and shades in the international arena were only some of the many ideological and political opponents of revolutionary Marxism against whom Lenin and the Bolshevik Party waged a bitter struggle. There was danger from international revisionism, which claimed it was renewing "obsolete" Marxism but, in fact, sought to dilute Marxism with a class-alien ideology and strip it of its militant revolutionary spirit. In exposing revisionism, Lenin wrote: "An ever subtler falsification of Marxism, an ever subtler presentation of anti-materialist doctrines under the guise of Marxism—this is the characteristic feature of modern revisionism in political economy, in questions of tactics and in philosophy generally, equally in epistemology and in sociology."*

While defending Marxist philosophy against the attacks of the revisionists, Lenin enlarged on the basic problems of dialectical and historical materialism. He enriched Marx's and Engels's materialist theory of cognition, strikingly showing the great strength of human intelligence, which is capable of cognising objective truth, and proving that socio-historical practice is the only reliable criterion of the trustworthiness of knowledge. He wrote with the greatest optimism of the might of human reason, of its achievements and of the prospects opening before it. "Human reason," he pointed out, "has discovered many amazing things in nature and will discover still more, and will thereby increase its power over nature."**

In the classical work *Materialism and Empirio-Criticism* he made a profound philosophical analysis of the latest discoveries in natural science which had upset a number of principles and concepts in physics. This break-up served as grounds for the spread of idealistic sentiments and views among a section of scientists who had lapsed into the error of believing that the latest data available to science refuted materialism. Lenin convincingly proved that the new discoveries in natural science reaffirmed the truth of materialism and that the adoption of dialectical materialism by scientists was an indispensable condition for progress in science because dialectical materialism was the only teaching correctly and scientifically explaining the world and inter-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 14, p. 330.

** Ibid., p. 282.

preting the processes taking place in it. Precisely this road was taken by many advanced natural scientists.

Lenin attached immense significance to the dialectical method, saying that materialist dialectics is the soul of Marxism. In showing the content of dialectics, he convincingly demonstrated that its substance lies in the law of the unity and struggle of opposites, which gives the key to understanding the self-development of matter in the process of which the old is replaced by the new. That is why Lenin always underscored the critical trend and revolutionary character of the Marxist dialectical method, which calls for advancement, for the replacement of the old by the new. Materialist dialectics irrefutably proves the transient nature of capitalist society, which has outworn itself and no longer conforms to the requirements of mankind, and shows that it will be inevitably replaced by a new and advanced social system.

The objective course of social development coincides with the aspirations of the working masses and of their leader, the proletariat, the most revolutionary class. They desire to replace capitalism with the new, communist system and are called upon to achieve this historically necessary change. The Party principle in ideology and politics, substantiated and developed by Lenin, induces people consciously to side with the position of the most progressive social force—the working class—because its revolutionary views and aspirations are the most correct and just.

With the scientific theory of Marx and Engels as his guide, Lenin evolved an integral teaching of imperialism. He put forward and substantiated the proposition that at the imperialist stage of its development capitalism enters a period in which economic and political contradictions reach the bursting point, leads towards the unleashing of imperialist wars and institutes reaction all along the line. This period witnesses a sharp intensification of the exploitation of the working people and increasing national oppression.

On the basis of a searching analysis of the features of the new, imperialist stage of capitalism, Lenin proved beyond a shadow of a doubt that the deep-rooted contradictions and ulcers of imperialism are incurable, that in the epoch of imperialism capitalism decays and dies and brings society to socialism. Socio-historical development itself places on the agenda the question of the proletarian revolution, of the

need for destroying imperialism and replacing it with socialism. "The epoch of capitalist imperialism," Lenin wrote, "is one of ripe and rotten-ripe capitalism, which is about to collapse, and which is mature enough to make way for socialism."^{*}

Having brought to light new laws governing the development of imperialism as an epoch "much more violent, spasmodic, catastrophic and full of conflict" than the pre-monopoly period of capitalism, Lenin drew the conclusion that initially socialism could triumph in a few or even in one country. He wrote: "...socialism cannot achieve victory simultaneously in all countries. It will achieve victory first in one or several countries, while the others will for some time remain bourgeois or pre-bourgeois."^{**} The Great October Socialist Revolution in Russia bore out this conclusion, which differs fundamentally from the earlier predominant Marxist view that the proletarian revolution could only be victorious if it was accomplished in the majority of the advanced countries simultaneously.

Lenin's teaching that socialism could triumph in one country was an important new word in the development of Marxism. It showed the working class that the socialist revolution was not something of the remote future and that it had to act confidently in overthrowing the exploiters and taking state power into its own hands as soon as the necessary objective and subjective prerequisites took shape in one capitalist country or another. This possibility, it will be recalled, appeared first and was successfully utilised in Russia, which proved to be the weakest link of the world capitalist system and where the working class was best prepared for the accomplishment of the socialist revolution.

Peerless scientist that he was, Lenin belongs to the phalanx of thinkers who believe that their main task is not only to explain the world but, chiefly, to remake it. Genuine leader of the proletariat, he exhaustively studied the life and struggle of the classes, maintained close contact with the working masses, painstakingly charted the strategy and tactics which brought the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat to victory and personally directed the revolutionary battles of the workers against capitalism. All his works are permeated with the spirit of Marxism as an eternally living,

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 109.

^{**} *Ibid.*, Vol. 23, p. 79.

developing teaching that demands fidelity to principles, rejects stereotype patterns and dogmas and always proceeds from a concrete account of the actual historical situation.

In preparing the ground for the triumph of the working class, Lenin scientifically substantiated the conditions, ways and means of the struggle for socialism.

He waged an uncompromising struggle against Right and "Left" opportunism, upholding and enlarging on the revolutionary content of Marxism and all-sidedly elaborating on the Marxist theory of socialist revolution.

Creatively developing the ideas of Marx and Engels and taking into account the experience of the Communist League and International Working Men's Association founded by them, Lenin evolved a comprehensive teaching of the revolutionary Party of the new type, of a Party that is the vanguard organisation and the principal weapon of the proletariat, without which it cannot overthrow capitalist rule, seize political power and build socialism. In addition to evolving the teaching of the revolutionary Party of the working class, he organised and reared such a party—the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

"In its struggle for power the proletariat has no other weapon but organisation,"* Lenin stressed. It is only by achieving a high level of organisation that the working class becomes a force which no class enemies can withstand. It must have its own political party to unite and organise it and direct its struggle. Lenin set up such a party and formulated its organisational, ideological, tactical and theoretical principles.

Over the course of many years, in bitter struggle with "legal Marxists", Economists, Mensheviks and other worshipers of spontaneity and tail-endism, who endeavoured to subordinate the working-class movement to the interests of the bourgeoisie, Lenin worked with indomitable energy to create and strengthen the new type of Party, the Bolshevik Party, in which were embodied all the basic Marxist propositions on the role of the Party as the conscious vanguard of the working class, as its political leader armed with advanced theory and a knowledge of the laws of social development and the class struggle.

The Party of the working class, Lenin taught, can fulfil

* Ibid., Vol. 7, p. 415.

its role as a rallying and directing centre if in its work it is guided by Marxist, revolutionary theory, which gives Communists a scientific programme of struggle for society's economic, political and social reorganisation by revolutionary methods.

The Party can discharge its role if it is closely linked with the working-class movement and expresses and consistently upholds the vital interests of the proletariat. In its turn, the proletarian struggle will not be successful until it "is led by a strong organisation of revolutionaries".* Lenin held that the most outstanding feature of the new type of Party, which differs fundamentally from all earlier existing political organisations of the working class is that it integrates scientific socialism with the revolutionary working-class movement. A genuinely Marxist-Leninist Party closely links theory with practice, the most advanced ideas with revolutionary action.

Founder and leader of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, great Lenin reared it in the spirit of devotion to the cause of the working class and hatred of the class enemies. He fostered in it the unflinching determination to advance to victory. He taught it to fear no difficulties and to move confidently towards its goal, leading, rallying, inspiring and organising the broadest masses of working people.

He attached paramount importance to unity in the Party and insisted that the Party guard this unity as the apple of its eye. He called for strict discipline, mandatory for all Party members, leaders and rank-and-file alike, and for a relentless struggle against alarmists, capitulationists and opportunists, who violate the Party's general line and corrupt its ranks. He demanded that Communists should not plume themselves on their successes or give themselves up to complacency and self-satisfaction, that they should resolutely criticise and remove errors. It was essential, he maintained, that the Party as a whole and every member should be closely linked with the people, value their trust and know their vital interests. The Communists, he said, were a drop in the ocean of people. They could lead the masses only if they correctly expressed what the people felt.

Democratic centralism, in which democracy and centralism are the indivisible aspects of a single whole, forms the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 475.

core of the Leninist organisational principles of the new type of Party.

It signifies unity between the Party's ideological, tactical and organisational principles as embodied in its Programme and Rules and whose observation is mandatory for every Communist and every Party organisation. The Party has one supreme organ, the Congress, and in the intervals between congresses, the Central Committee. Discipline in the Party is binding on all members. The Party's activity rests on the unconditional subordination of the minority to the majority, of lower to higher organisations. "After the competent bodies have decided," Lenin wrote, "*all of us, as members of the Party, must act as one man.*"**

The Party, its congresses and Central Committee determine the line to be followed by the entire organisation and, at the same time, give the utmost encouragement to the activity and initiative of all its members and organisations in charting and fulfilling the Party decisions and adapting the single political line to the specifics of local conditions. On this point Lenin said that centralism, understood in a truly democratic sense, creates the possibility "of a full and unhampered development not only of specific local features but also of local inventiveness, local initiative, of diverse ways, methods and means of progress to the common goal".**

Democracy signifies that all leading Party bodies from top to bottom, are elective, accountable and removable. It signifies collective leadership, initiative and active participation by all Communists in Party life, and the utmost development of criticism and self-criticism. The strict observance and consistent development of *inner-Party democracy* are an inviolable rule of the CPSU. The Party insists on unflagging attention and respect for the opinions and suggestions of its members. In its turn, the promotion of inner-Party democracy presupposes the utmost strengthening of discipline in the Party and the enhancement of the responsibility of each member for the affairs of his local organisation and of the Party as a whole.

Democratic centralism enables the Party to foster the activity of all its members, unite their boundless energy into a single will and direct it towards the revolutionary remak-

* Ibid., Vol. 11, p. 323.

** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 208.

ing of society. Small wonder that the enemies of the Communist Party constantly attack democratic centralism, which is the cardinal tenet of Lenin's teaching of the new type of Party.

All the principles evolved by Lenin are part and parcel of the arsenal of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and form the foundation of its unity and strength. Steadfastly using the Leninist teaching as its guide and strictly abiding by the Leninist principles underlying the organisation of its work and the norms of its inner life, it has become a powerful and monolithic Party with deep-rooted links with the people, the directing and guiding force of Soviet society, and the inspirer and organiser of the Soviet people in their drive to build communism.

The Communist Party enjoys the unbounded trust of the Soviet people, who see in its practical work and policy the expression of their basic interests and therefore give all its undertakings their utmost backing. As the political leader and militant vanguard of the Soviet people, the CPSU has been and remains first and foremost the Party of the working class, the most advanced class of Soviet society. Today it has nearly 14 million members, almost 40 per cent of whom are workers and 15.6 per cent collective farmers. Its membership includes foremost representatives of the production-technological intelligentsia, scientists and workers in culture and art.

Lenin's enlargement of the Marxist teaching of the proletarian dictatorship is of immense significance for the international revolutionary movement. Lenin stressed that the question of the dictatorship of the proletariat is the basic issue of the socialist revolution and the main element of Marxism; he enlarged, therefore, on the most essential aspects of that dictatorship, its social nature, the conditions under which it is established, its principal functions and forms, and its role and importance. He gave a resolute rebuff to the opportunists who opposed the dictatorship of the proletariat, proving the historical need for this dictatorship as a means of building socialism, the new, exploiter-less society. Mankind, he said, would arrive at socialism *only through the dictatorship of the proletariat*. To bourgeois democracy, which expresses the interests of the exploiting minority, Lenin counterposed the proletarian dictatorship as a fundamentally new, and higher type of democracy, ensuring the enlistment

of the broadest sections of the people into the administration of the affairs of society and the state and expressing the interests of the vast majority of the people.

Lenin's greatest contribution to the creative development of the Marxist teaching of the proletarian dictatorship was his idea of Soviets as the new type of state. Lenin showed the historic importance of the Republic of Soviets as a state form of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which is immeasurably more democratic than any bourgeois-parliamentary republic.

Lenin was brought round to this conclusion by the initiative of the masses, who, acting on their own accord, first set up Soviets of Workers' Deputies during the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Russia in 1905-07. The Soviets thus spring from the historic initiative of the people. Lenin saw in them the prototype of the working people's socialist state.

Characterising the Soviets as a new, higher type of democracy, he wrote: "It was an authority open to all, it carried out all its functions before the eyes of the masses, was accessible to the masses, sprang directly from the masses; and was a direct and immediate instrument, of the popular masses, of their will."*

The victory of the Great October Revolution in Russia and the formation of the Soviet socialist state on one-sixth of the globe was a triumph of the ideas of Leninism. Lenin was the direct inspirer, organiser and leader of the Revolution and the founder and leader of the world's first state of workers and peasants.

He showed the epochal, international significance of that Revolution, calling it the world's turning-point and a new chapter of world history, considering that its contribution was that it "has charted the road to socialism for the whole world and has shown the bourgeoisie that their triumph is coming to an end".** Stressing the enormous significance of the Soviet state for the working people of all countries, he wrote: "Our socialist Republic of Soviets will stand secure, as a torch of international socialism and as an example to all the working people."*** On the international importance of the October Revolution and Soviet rule he wrote: "Expe-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 352.

** Ibid., Vol. 28, p. 44.

*** Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 472.

rience has proved that, on certain very important questions of the proletarian revolution, *all* countries will inevitably have to do what Russia has done.”* Further, he noted that other countries would bring many new features into the forms and means of accomplishing the socialist revolution and establishing the dictatorship of the proletariat without deviating from their cardinal principles. This was fully borne out by subsequent proletarian revolutions and by the building of socialism in a number of countries.

Guided by the teaching of Marx and Engels and summing up the practical experience of the Soviet state, Lenin specified the problems relating to the two phases of communist society, the building of socialism and socialism's evolution into full-fledged communism. A concrete plan of socialist construction in the Soviet Union was drawn up under Lenin's guidance. He not only indicated the ways and means of building socialism but saw the social forces capable of carrying out this epoch-making task. Socialism, he taught, is the living creative work of the popular masses. The working people, he said, would build the new life themselves and use their own experience to resolve the problems of the socialist organisation of society no matter how difficult they might be.

The theory of scientific communism, evolved by Marx and Engels and amplified by Lenin, is enriched by the practical experience of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries and by the experience of fraternal Communist and Workers' Parties. It is embodied in the world socialist system, forms the scientific backbone of the far-reaching socialist transformations being implemented in the countries of that system, and serves as the source inspiring the struggle of the international working class and the liberation movement of all peoples who see their future in socialism.

LENINIST LINE OF THE CPSU

The Great October Socialist Revolution set the Soviet people the unprecedented task of building a socialist society, which had hitherto been only an object of theory. Lenin and the Communist Party led the Soviet people towards socialism

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 31.

along unblazed trails. "The new task before us," Lenin wrote, "has never been tackled anywhere else before."* But no matter how difficult it might be, he said, this task was quite feasible. The Republic of Soviets had everything it needed for building socialist society. "Our natural wealth, our manpower and the splendid impetus which the great revolution has given to the creative powers of the people are ample material to build a truly mighty and abundant Russia."**

Under the leadership of the Communist Party with Lenin at its head, the proletarian revolution resolutely cleared the road to socialism from the historical trash that had been accumulated by the exploiting system in the course of centuries. All the numerous attempts of the Russian and world bourgeoisie to recover their lost domination and restore the old order were heroically repulsed by the people who had been liberated by the revolution. The Soviet state staunchly bore enormous hardships, honourably withstood all trials, emerged victorious in the Civil War and defeated the interventionist forces of 14 capitalist countries.

The October Revolution strikingly demonstrated that when the people are led by a genuinely revolutionary Marxist Party, which can make the masses believe in their own strength, organise and rally them, the revolutionary energy and colossal strength of the people can break down and sweep away all the obstacles to freedom, democracy and socialism.

Lenin considered the active participation of all the working people in socialist construction as an indispensable and the principal condition of the triumph of socialism. The profoundly democratic essence of socialism is manifested in the fact that the people build the new life themselves. Lenin called on the Party to rally the multi-million-strong Soviet people for the immense creative effort and raise, as he put it, the lowest of the lower classes to a level where they could make history. "Victory will belong only to those," he wrote, "who have faith in the people, those who are immersed in the life-giving spring of popular creativity."***

One of the basic features of Soviet social system is that it gives the widest scope for the activity of the masses, who

* Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 379.

** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 161.

*** Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 292.

are the real makers of history. In the Soviet Union working people, anonymous, unnoticed and frequently redundant under capitalism, are building the new life with their own hands and moving forward from their own midst thousands upon thousands of new heroes and leaders in industry, agriculture, science, technology, culture and art.

After the October Revolution Lenin continued to develop the teaching of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialism could not be built without that dictatorship. The bourgeoisie was dreaming of recovering the positions it had lost. Only a workers' and peasants' state could paralyse its unremitting attempts in that direction, crush the resistance of the exploiters and organise the building of the new, socialist life. The highest principle of the proletarian dictatorship, Lenin emphasised, is the alliance of the working class with the working peasant masses. He passionately called upon the Party, the workers and the working peasants to strengthen this alliance under the leadership of the proletariat. "The new society, which will be based on the alliance of the workers and peasants," he said, "is inevitable ... and we are helping to work out for this society the forms of alliance between the workers and peasants. We shall get this done and we shall create an alliance of the workers and peasants that is so sound that no power on earth will break it."*

Time and again Lenin stressed that a monolithic Communist Party which derives its strength from unity, revolutionary theory and unbreakable ties with the people, a Party, whose role, far from diminishing, increases after power has been seized by the working class, is of tremendous significance for the dictatorship of the proletariat and the building of socialism.

Small wonder that the bourgeoisie and their agents fear the revolutionary Party of the working class. The enemies of the Soviet people have always waged a frenzied struggle against the Communist Party, understanding that if they manage to undermine it, the dictatorship of the proletariat will consequently be weakened. The slogan "for the Soviets without the Communists" was put forward by the counter-revolution precisely to that end. The Trotskyites, Zinovievites, Bukharinites, bourgeois nationalists and other anti-Leninist groups went to all lengths in an attempt to destroy

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 177.

the Communist Party, to form factions within the Party for the purpose of carrying on subversive and divisive activities, and to tear the trade unions, the Young Communist League and other mass organisations away from the Party.

However, all the attacks on the Party were repulsed. The Communist Party developed along the lines charted by Lenin. It strengthened its inner unity and cohesion, enforced strict and, at the same time, conscious discipline, resolutely purged itself of opportunists and renegades and gave the utmost encouragement to the initiative of the Party rank and file, always and in everything setting the interests of the working people above all else.

With crystal clarity and the profundity of genius Lenin formulated the tasks of the Soviet people in the building of socialism, pointing out that socialism could triumph only on the basis of modern technology and a powerful socialist industry. The key tasks of socialist construction were industrialisation and the creation of the economic foundation of the new society. "A large-scale machine industry capable of reorganising agriculture," Lenin wrote, "is the only material basis that is possible for socialism."* The capitalist encirclement and the constant menace of attack by the bourgeois states made it necessary to accelerate industrialisation. This strained the means of the young Republic. "We are economising in all things, even in schools,"** Lenin said. The great labour effort of the Soviet people under the Party's leadership during the years in which Lenin's electrification programme and the first five-year plans were carried out converted the Soviet Union into a leading industrial power.

The CPSU worked with similar energy to implement Lenin's plan of bringing the peasants to socialism through co-operatives. Lenin regarded the peasants' transition to socialism as a major task conforming to the vital interests of the working class and the peasantry alike, emphasising that "small-scale farming will not bring deliverance from want".** The only way to deliver the working peasants from dependence on the kulaks, abolish the economic roots of capitalism in the countryside and thereby resolve one of the cardinal tasks of the socialist revolution was to place the scattered peasant farms on a new, socialist foundation.

* Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 459.

** Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 426.

*** Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 148.

Some enemies of socialism write that Marx and Engels were not interested in the peasant question, that this was solely a "Russian" problem. But that is not true. The founders of scientific communism attached immense importance to this problem. "Our task relative to the small peasant," Engels wrote, "consists, in the first place, in effecting a transition of his private enterprise and private possession to co-operative ones, not forcibly, but by dint of example and the proffer of social assistance for this purpose."* With the teaching of Marx and Engels as their point of departure, Lenin and the Party all-sidedly enlarged on the peasant problem, substantiating it theoretically and showing the ways and means of resolving it—through socialist co-operatives under the dictatorship of the working class. An alliance with the working class was the sole means showing the peasants the way out of their difficult position under capitalism, and the socialist co-operation of small producers, Lenin stressed, was the only way to build a lasting economic foundation for socialism in the countryside.

Developments have fully borne out the fact that Lenin's policy was correct in all its aspects. The Soviet Union's conversion into a great industrial power created a solid material basis for economic independence and for the technological reconstruction of all branches of the economy. This consolidated the triumph of socialist relations in industry and boosted the defence capability. Implementation of Lenin's co-operative plan gave the Soviet Union the world's largest-scale socialist agriculture and strengthened the alliance between the working class and the peasants. The last exploiting class, the kulaks, was abolished on the basis of nation-wide collectivisation.

The attainment of major political and economic aims was accompanied by a cultural revolution in the course of which a new, genuinely people's system of education was built up. Lenin showed the need for promoting the culture of the peoples of the Soviet Union. The Party, he said, had to make sure that in the Soviet Union "learning shall really become part of our very being, that it shall actually and fully become a constituent element of our social life."**

* Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* in 3 vols., Vol. III, Moscow, 1970, p. 470.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 489.

The masses were given access to the cultural wealth accumulated by mankind. The cultural revolution made it possible to train a numerous army of intellectuals and ensure the national economy with specialists. Without this it would have been impossible to promote science and technology on a large scale and consolidate socialist ideology.

By pursuing the policies framed by Lenin, the Party brought the country to the complete and final triumph of socialism. This magnificent victory demonstrated the historic mission of the working class in practice and was a triumph of Marxism-Leninism. Socialism unfurled its advantages over capitalism in all spheres: by establishing social ownership of the means of production and liberating the workers and peasants from exploitation it created the conditions for systematically raising the living standard and cultural level of the people, instituting social and national equality, ensuring genuine freedom and democracy and giving people every opportunity for displaying their talents and gifts. The Soviet Union was the first country to bring into operation the basic rule of socialism—"from each according to his ability, to each according to his work"—which for many peoples remains only a cherished dream.

The unity of the multi-national Soviet people and the fraternal friendship and co-operation between workers, collective farmers and intellectuals, between working people of all nationalities, are socialism's greatest gain and source of immeasurable strength. Consolidation of the unbreakable friendship between the peoples of the USSR and the flourishing state of the economy and culture of the socialist republics convincingly demonstrate the correctness of Lenin's teaching and of the Party's policy in the solution of the national problem and underscore the triumph of proletarian internationalism.

The strength and viability of socialism were subjected to a severe test in the Great Patriotic War of the Soviet Union against nazi Germany. In that life and death struggle the Soviet people not only upheld the honour and independence of their country but, by utterly defeating the nazi hordes, saved world civilisation from the plague of nazism.

Implementation of the Marxist-Leninist teaching of socialist construction has opened for the Soviet people the prospect for a gradual transition to communism. Lenin had always regarded the building of socialism and communism as

two inseparable aspects of the goal before the Party and the Soviet people. He wrote: "In striving for socialism, however, we are convinced that it will develop into communism."** The CPSU mapped out the programme of communist construction on the basis of Lenin's injunctions and behests. "The future society we are striving for," Lenin wrote of communism, "the society in which all must work, the society in which there will be no class distinctions, will take a long time to build."***

The economy inevitably becomes the chief sphere of the struggle for complete communism. The building of the material and technical basis of communism is, therefore, the principal economic task set by the Programme of the CPSU and by the decisions of the 23rd Party Congress. This is the foundation ensuring the systematic enhancement of the people's living standard and cultural level, the steady improvement of socialist social relations and their gradual evolution into communist relations, and the further development of socialist democracy.

The advantages of the socialist system are demonstrated by the high rate of growth of socialist production, which outstrips the growth rates of the capitalist economy. The annual growth rate of industrial output for 1951-67 averaged 10.5 per cent in the USSR, 4.5 per cent in the USA, 2.8 per cent in Britain and 5.5 per cent in France. While maintaining their superiority in the rates of growth, the socialist countries increased their volume of industrial output in 1968 approximately 11-fold as compared with the pre-war level; in the capitalist countries it only increased 4-fold within the same period. Lenin's prevision is coming true. "I am convinced," he said, "that the Soviets will overtake and outstrip the capitalists and that our gain will not be a purely economic one."***

Production rose 79-fold in 1968 over the 1913 level. In 1968 the USSR produced 107 million tons of steel, 639,000 million kwh of electric power and 309 million tons of oil. The Soviet Union has more kilometres of electrified railways than the USA, Britain, France, the Federal Republic of Germany and Japan combined. Lenin's proposition that com-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 546.

** Ibid., Vol. 29, p. 324.

*** Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 458.

munism is Soviet power plus the electrification of the whole country is acquiring real and tangible content.

The Party is giving tireless attention to the promotion of a highly developed agriculture capable of fully satisfying the population's food requirements and industry's requirements in raw materials. As a result, compared with the 1961-65 level, total farm output increased 19 per cent in 1966-68. In 1968 the grain output totalled 165 million tons, which was a 30 per cent gain over the average for 1961-65.

The present period in the life of Soviet society is witnessing the building of the material and technical basis of communism under conditions of a full-scale scientific and technological revolution, and the implementation of important measures launched by the Communist Party and the Soviet Government to improve the scientific management of the country's economic, socio-political and cultural life. The key conditions for achieving a rapid growth of the national economy are still largely the enhancement of the efficacy of capital investments and of existing production assets, the promotion of labour productivity and the improvement of the quality of output. A growing role is played in production by science.

The high level attained by the Soviet economy makes it possible, while continuing to give priority to the growth of leading industries, considerably to step up the development of industries satisfying the material and cultural requirements of the people. The feasibility of the plans charted in the Soviet Union is vividly manifested in the fact that the growth rate of the economy in key indices—national income, industrial output, retail trade, real incomes of the population, average wages and salaries, and remuneration for labour at the collective farms—was faster during the current five-year plan period than the average rates envisaged in the directives of the 23rd Congress of the CPSU.

The Party devotes considerable attention to improving planning and providing more economic incentives in the national economy. Here it is guided by the extremely important Leninist principles underlying socialist economic management. Socialism's fundamental advantage, Lenin pointed out, is its planned economic development and centralised regulation by the people. "All should work according to a single common plan," Lenin wrote, "on common

land, in common factories and in accordance with a common system.”*

The current economic reform is founded on the efficient enforcement of the laws of the socialist economy, on the advantages of the Soviet system and on the immense experience accumulated by the Party in directing social development. Its chief aim is to promote the democratic foundations of management, enhance centralised state planning and raise the scientific level of economic plans. Improved state planning mirrors the trend towards the further socialisation of production and the attainment of a higher level of state ownership.

In the USSR today the possibility and need for furthering local initiative by the working people and drawing them into more active participation in the management of production and in the utilisation of all the inner reserves of every enterprise are greater than ever before. The new conditions are giving a new content to Lenin's injunctions that along with the attainment of more efficiency in state planning it is necessary to extend the “enterprise and initiative by each large establishment in the disposal of financial and material resources”.**

Soviet society's development strikingly corroborates Lenin's observation that the building of communism must rest also on the use of material and moral incentives. Economic methods of administration, improved in the course of the economic reform, consist in making the fullest use of the advantages of socialism and the identity and features of the economic interests of the working people, the individual enterprises and society as a whole. The planned and active use of commodity-money relations and categories such as profit, prices, credit and cost accounting, are called on to play an important role in economic activity. Under the socialist economic system these categories acquire a fundamentally different content than under capitalism: instead of being the vehicles of exploitation, which does not exist under socialism, they serve as economic levers to promote the economy in the interests of the whole people.

The Communist Party places the interests of the people above everything else, being guided by Lenin's tenet that

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 292.

** Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 434.

"*only* socialism can meet their interests".* Under socialism the fullest satisfaction of the people's growing material and cultural requirements and the all-round development of the individual are the direct and principal purpose of production. This is precisely the aim of socialist production in the Soviet Union.

In terms of per working person real incomes in the USSR have grown in the period 1913-68 more than 7-fold in industry and building, and 11-fold in agriculture. In 1968 average wages and salaries rose 7.5 per cent. Remuneration for labour on the collective farms has been showing a particularly rapid rise in recent years. The people receive steadily increasing annual allowances and benefits from the social consumption funds, which in 1968 totalled 55,000 million rubles. These funds cover free education and medical service, longer paid leaves, pensions, allowances, scholarships, health home and spa services at considerable discounts for a steadily growing number of people, and large-scale housing construction. Nearly 11 million people are rehoused annually in the Soviet Union.

The USSR has forged to the forefront in world culture and science. In 1968 it had more than 800,000 scientific workers or one-fourth of the world's total. It was the first country to place an atomic power station in operation, build commercial jet aircraft and inter-continental ballistic missiles, and launch an artificial Earth satellite. The first manned space flight was accomplished by a Soviet citizen.

All this is evidence of the notable successes that have been achieved in consolidating socialism and building communism. But it does not mean that all problems have been solved. Besides, life constantly poses new problems.

The CPSU is fully aware that the building of communism is a tremendously responsible and difficult task, and, reared by Lenin, it does not indulge in boasting or conceit. The Soviet Union is confronted with tasks of supreme importance. But what has already been achieved by the Soviet people is of epoch-making significance.

A wonderful renewal of all aspects of life is taking place in the Soviet Union, whose road is illumined by the teaching of the great Lenin.

* Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 333.

INTERNATIONAL CHARACTER OF LENINISM

Lenin is the pride of all mankind. In him history gave the working masses of the whole world a brilliant champion of their cherished aspirations and hopes, a wise leader and a man who contributed immeasurably towards the happiness of working people in all continents.

A genuine proletarian revolutionary, he took close to heart the revolutionary struggle of the workers of all countries and followed with unflagging attention and sympathy the national liberation movement of the colonial and dependent peoples. His whole life was permeated with the striving to end capitalist slavery all over the world. He contributed immensely towards the elaboration of the scientific principles of the programme, organisation, strategy and tactics of the international communist movement, took a direct part in strengthening the fraternal Parties, shared with them the vast experience of the Bolshevik Party and called on the Communists of all countries to make every effort to promote the international unity of the revolutionary working-class movement and steadfastly expand their link with the masses in order to become the genuine vanguard of all revolutionary forces.

The enemies of Leninism seek to make it appear a purely Russian phenomenon, rejecting its international content. Some of them maintain that the road of the October Revolution is for economically backward countries, that Leninism is a specific interpretation of Marxism applicable to conditions of backwardness. Others assert that the Soviet Union's socialist development is a purely European phenomenon, and that, therefore, it does not suit Asian, African and Latin American countries.

These concepts of Leninism are fundamentally wrong. Leninism is neither an exclusively Russian nor specifically European phenomenon. Having emerged as a continuation of Marxism at a time when capitalism had entered its last, imperialist stage, Leninism expressed the objective requirements of *world* social development.

The following cardinal circumstances determine Leninism's international character.

First, by virtue of many historical reasons at the turn of the century Russia was the focus of all the basic contradictions of the world imperialist system, while the October Revolution was the starting point and pivot of the con-

temporary world revolutionary process. The principal laws of this process manifested themselves with increasing force in the successively mounting waves of three Russian revolutions, which were the most significant historical events of the 20th century. These revolutions, particularly the Great October Socialist Revolution, which shook the world, were of immense international importance. They gave a powerful impetus to the revolutionary movement in all countries.

Second, the international character of Leninism springs from the many-faceted experience of the October Revolution itself and of the subsequent experience of building socialism in the USSR. On the eve of the Revolution there were in Russia the most diverse socio-economic systems—large centres of capitalist industry with a working class, a semi-feudal landowning system in the countryside, a colonial and semi-colonial regime in Central Asia, and almost primitive backwardness in the Far North—systems and conditions of life intrinsic to different countries. With its many social systems and multi-national population, pre-Revolution Russia personified the specifics of many countries in different continents. Leninism mirrored the extensive experience of the Bolshevik Party, which, at the various stages of its struggle, had to come to grips with problems that arose in economically developed and backward areas, in industrial, working-class centres and in the poverty-stricken countryside, in regions with a high cultural level and in huge areas where illiteracy and lack of culture were predominant.

Third, on account of Russia's position on the fringe of the developed capitalist countries of the West and the colonial, semi-colonial and dependent countries of the East, the Russian working-class movement coalesced with the West European revolutionary working-class movement and with the national liberation movement of the colonial peoples. Leninism emerged and developed as the sum total of the experience not only of the Russian but also of the world working-class and the national liberation, anti-colonial movements. Lenin, whom circumstances forced to live for many years in emigration in Switzerland, France, Britain, Germany, Poland and other countries, had close links with socialist circles in Western Europe and was active in the international socialist movement. Devoting considerable attention to the anti-colonial struggle of the Eastern peoples, he generalised the experience, forms and methods of the

revolutionary movement and the national liberation struggle of all countries.

Fourth, Leninism did not appear from nothing. It emerged on the solid foundation of Marxism as its continuation. It summed up the latest achievements of world science and culture. Every cardinal question of the theory and tactics of the international revolutionary movement propounded by Marx and Engels was dealt with in Leninism. Lenin enlarged on and enriched Marxism in line with the fundamental propositions of the teaching of Marx and Engels.

Leninism is the Marxism of the new epoch. It has legitimately become the ideological and theoretical foundation of the contemporary international communist movement.

Lenin made a tremendous contribution towards the development of the world working-class and entire revolutionary liberation movement. He gave every attention to achieving greater internationalist unity of the revolutionary forces. This unity was imperatively demanded by the changed historical situation, capitalism's evolution into its imperialist stage and proletarian revolutions, becoming the task of the day. When the Second International foundered and its collapse became imminent, Lenin set about consolidating the revolutionary wing in the international working-class movement, gradually fashioning the internationalist nucleus from which the Communist International subsequently sprang.

Lenin decisively influenced the charting of the Comintern's ideological and theoretical platform, and the elaboration of the fundamental questions of the strategy and tactics and organisational principles of the world communist movement.

He waged an unremitting struggle for the unity of the world working-class and communist movement on a principled foundation. The united working-class front policy framed by him has been adopted by the international communist movement. This policy calls for united action by the workers in the struggle for their immediate aims, for the enlistment into the front of the most diverse contingents of the working class, including the contingents influenced by reformism and, thereby, raising the general level of the working-class movement and bringing it, on the strength of its own experience, gradually to revolutionary positions.

Lenin helped the newly formed Communist Parties correctly to raise the united workers' front slogan and warned them

of Left-sectarian and Right-opportunist errors in the implementation of that slogan. He taught the Communists to combine a principled stand with flexibility in politics. He drew their attention to the need for tying in the united front policy more closely with the tasks of the anti-fascist and anti-war struggle, with the movement for peace, democratic rights and freedoms.

Lenin's treatment of the national and colonial problem was an eminent service to history. Lenin's profound analysis of the imperialist stage of capitalism revealed irreconcilable contradictions between the imperialist countries, on the one hand, and the hundreds of millions of people of the colonial and dependent countries, on the other, and showed that for these peoples imperialism signified the most ruthless exploitation and brutal oppression. Lenin saw that the oppressed peoples of the colonies could be liberated from the imperialist yoke only in struggle against imperialism, and closely linked this liberation with the general struggle of the international proletariat for the overthrow of capitalism. At the same time, he theoretically substantiated the important role played by the national liberation movement in the world revolutionary process, writing: "... the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism."*

From this he drew the conclusion that the international proletariat had to give every possible support to the national liberation movement of the oppressed and dependent peoples, that the actions of these revolutionary forces had to be united in the struggle against imperialism. This was a *fundamentally new*, Leninist word in the Marxist theory of revolution. The Leninist strategy of strengthening unity and co-operation between all the main torrents of the world revolutionary process is of the greatest importance for the struggle of the Marxist-Leninist Parties and all other revolutionary forces against imperialism.

Present-day reality uninterruptedly provides confirmation of the immense vitality and fruitfulness of Lenin's immortal teaching. Lenin enriched, developed and moved forward

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

Marxist theory to such an extent that today it is no longer possible to be a real Marxist without becoming a Leninist and studying all that Lenin had introduced into the treasure-store of scientific communism. For that reason the Marxism of today is rightly called Marxism-Leninism. Marxism and Leninism form an integral, indissoluble international teaching.

Today only he can be considered a genuine, consistent Marxist who is guided by the Leninist method of analysing social processes, who proves his fidelity to Leninism not by words but by deeds, who is uncompromising to the class enemies in the Leninist way. Leninism demands a really scientific approach to all phenomena of life, organic unity between theory and practice and an active struggle against bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideology, which is hostile to scientific socialism.

The founders of Marxism-Leninism believed that for the revolutionary proletariat and its organisations it is of paramount importance to employ all forms of the class struggle: "Ever since the working-class movement came into being the struggle has been waged by plan in all three co-ordinated and inter-related directions: theoretical, political and economic." Subscribing to this proposition, which was expounded by Engels, Lenin pointed out that scientific communism "recognises *not two* forms of the great struggle" of the working class (political and economic), "*but three, placing the theoretical struggle on a par with the first two*".*

Lenin contended that it was necessary to wage a consistent struggle for the purity and creative development of the revolutionary teaching of the working class. His whole life illustrates this. He resolutely repelled all assaults on revolutionary Marxism by opportunists and nationalists of all hues and called on the international communist movement always to remember that at definite periods the "zigzags of bourgeois tactics intensify revisionism within the labour movement".** At the same time, he constantly warned the movement against petty-bourgeois "Left" adventurism and sectarianism, a trend which "is very revolutionary in words, but not in the least revolutionary as far as its real views ... are concerned"***

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 370.

** Ibid., Vol. 16, p. 351.

*** Ibid., Vol. 6, p. 288.

Lenin's ideological heritage serves as tested weapon for the Communist and Workers' Parties in their struggle against the bourgeoisie and all varieties of opportunism. While persecuting Communists, the imperialists go to all ends to undermine the Party of the working class ideologically. Counting on nationalism, chauvinism, Right-wing opportunism and "Left" adventurist revisionism, they seek to disunite the Communist Parties, weaken the socialist countries and drive a wedge between them. To achieve these ends they do not scruple to use any means. They carry on unbridled anti-socialist propaganda, slander the policy of the USSR and other socialist countries and make every effort to discredit the noble aims of the Communists.

The Communist Parties oppose the insidious strategy of imperialism and its ideological subversion with proletarian internationalism and a determined struggle against imperialism and its agents.

A great international teaching of the proletariat and all working people, Leninism is a mighty and all-conquering ideological weapon against bourgeois ideology, revisionism and nationalism. It is the banner of our age and a powerful means of remaking the world by revolution.

LENINISM IS WINNING THE WORLD

In all countries increasing numbers of working people are becoming convinced of the great truth of Lenin's teaching. They see in Leninism a science that answers all the questions being posed by modern social development and are coming to realise that only the road charted by Lenin makes it possible to liberate working people from capitalist oppression, deliver the peoples from wars, emancipate mankind from imperialist tyranny and build a new life. Every major issue agitating modern society—the direction in which imperialism is developing, the class struggle in the capitalist countries, the socialist revolution, the conquest of state power by the working class, the national liberation movement, the questions of war and peace, peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, relations between socialist and capitalist countries, and the ways and means of building socialism and communism—has been profoundly and comprehensively studied by Lenin. The Leninist teaching is a

reliable ideological guide for all the revolutionary forces called on to renew the world along communist lines.

This has been fully borne out by historical development over the past few decades.

The far-reaching revolutionary transformations that have taken place during the past fifty years have fundamentally changed the social make-up of our planet. To see that this is so it is sufficient to glance at the political map of the world.

Political Map of the World: 1919 and Beginning of 1969

	1919				Beginning of 1969			
	Territory		Population (estimate)		Territory		Population (estimate)	
	million sq. km.	% of world total	million persons	% of world total	million sq. km.	% of world total	million persons	% of world total
1. World	135.8	100	1,777	100	135.8	100	3,520	100
Of which:								
(a) socialist countries	21.7	16.0	138	7.8	35.2	25.9	1,210	34.4
(b) other countries	114.1	84.0	1,639	92.2	100.6	74.1	2,310	65.6
2. Large imperialist powers* and their colonies	60.3	44.4	855	48.1	12.3	9	539.2	15.3
3. All colonies and semi-colonies	97.8	72	1,235	69.4	5	3.7	36.3	1
4. Former colonial and semi-colonial countries that became sovereign states after 1919 (excluding socialist countries) .	—	—	—	—	79.1	58.2	1,616	45.9

* USA, Britain, France, FRG (in 1919—Germany), Japan and Italy.

Capitalism has, thus, irretrievably lost its predominant position in world politics. The epoch of its undivided sway has been supplanted by the epoch of the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Exploitation of man has been uprooted in huge areas of the world. Many peoples have shaken off the chains of imperialist oppression. Socialist ideals have won the minds and hearts of hundreds of millions of people and have become a mighty material force.

The world-wide revolutionary process by which capitalism is replaced by socialism continues to develop in width and depth. Today three main torrents interact in this process. They are the world socialist system, the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and the national liberation struggle of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In the anti-imperialist struggle the leading force is the world socialist system. Although it has only been in existence for a little over two decades, it has demonstrated its great viability and strength. The following gives an idea of its might. The socialist countries in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance occupy only 18 per cent of the world's territory and have only 10 per cent of its population. However, currently, they account for approximately one-third of the world industrial product.

The achievements of the world socialist system are an inspiring example for the working people of the developed capitalist countries and for the young states that have started out on independent development. "The rise and development of the international socialist system is part and parcel of the world-wide class struggle. The socialist system is the principal obstacle to imperialism."*

The teaching of Leninism, embodied in the practice of the world socialist system, is a powerful weapon in the struggle for social progress and helps to mould the class and revolutionary consciousness of working people throughout the world. Important changes are taking place in the modern working-class movement.

Today the world witnesses unprecedented mass action by the working people. Nearly 10 million people took part in the general strike staged in France in the period from May to June 1968. More than 12 million people took part in the general strike in Italy in November 1968, and in February 1969 a general strike in that country involved over 18 million people. In 1968 14 million Japanese working people came out for the traditional spring offensive. At the present

* *World Marxist Review*, No. 8, August 1969, p. 2.

stage of the general crisis of capitalism the strike struggle has reached a scale unknown for a long time in the history of the working-class movement of the imperialist countries.

The class battles in the Western countries have been marked in recent years by a number of new phenomena in the mass working-class and anti-monopoly movement. The most important of these phenomena are that the working class there has demonstrated a definite tendency towards united action and that its struggle for social progress is being joined by engineering and technological personnel, office employees, intellectuals, students and the middle strata in town and country. This broadening of the social composition of the participants in anti-monopoly actions has led to a further widening of the rupture between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the upper echelon of the state apparatus linked with it, on the one side, and the rest of the population, on the other.

Today the working class is pressing for demands such as democratic nationalisation, greater representation for the working people in parliament, the enactment of progressive social legislation, and so on. Although these objectives do not go beyond the framework of the capitalist system, the struggle to achieve them undermines monopoly rule and helps the working class to become aware of its political tasks.

Objective development confirms Lenin's teaching that there is an inseparable link between the proletarian struggle for socialism and the broad democratic movements. "The socialist revolution," Lenin pointed out, "is not a single act, it is not one battle on one front, but a whole epoch of acute class conflicts, a long series of battles on all fronts, i.e., on all questions of economics and politics, battles that can only end in the expropriation of the bourgeoisie. It would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat from the socialist revolution or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc. On the contrary, in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy."^{*}

Leninism powerfully influences the development of the

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 144.

national liberation struggle of the peoples of colonial and dependent countries. The new balance of socio-political forces in the world has accelerated the disintegration of imperialism's colonial system. Hundreds of millions of people have delivered themselves from colonial slavery during the past 25 years. A far-reaching programme of socio-economic reforms undermining the foundations of capitalism has been launched in some of the young developing states. Former colonial countries are making every effort to consolidate their political and economic independence. The liberation struggle is receiving irreplaceable support from the socialist countries.

The socialist countries and the international working class are making consistent efforts to strengthen the alliance between all democratic and revolutionary forces, the teaching of Lenin being the invariable guide of the world revolutionary working-class and liberation movements.

Leninism has been, remains and will continue to be the scientific foundation for a correct solution of the intricate and difficult problems arising on the road to the world-wide triumph of communism. The common duty of the great army of Communists and of all fighters against imperialism is consistently to uphold the purity of this teaching, enlarge on it in the Leninist way and make skilful and all-sided use of the Lenin heritage.

Inspired by Leninist ideals, the international communist movement has achieved grandiose successes and become the most influential political force of modern times. Communist Parties are active in all continents. In a number of countries they are the ruling parties. They function also in imperialist states and in many developing countries, where they are in the front-line of the struggle against reaction, for social progress. The more consistently every Communist Party combines international and national tasks and the more actively and skilfully it applies the principles of Leninism, the more successfully does it fulfil its aims and tasks.

The highly successful International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow in June 1969 demonstrated the fidelity of the international communist movement to Marxism-Leninism. Its proceedings and results upset the wishful predictions of the enemies of communism, who hoped that the Meeting would not be held or, if it was held, would end in failure. The changes that had taken place in the world since the international forums of the Communist

and Workers' Parties in 1957 and 1960 were thoroughly analysed at the Meeting.

The historical truth and international importance of Leninism were underscored at the Meeting, which adopted an Address under the heading of *Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin*, stating in part: "The victory of the socialist revolution in a group of countries, the emergence of the world socialist system, the gains of the working-class movement in capitalist countries, the appearance of peoples of former colonial and semi-colonial countries in the arena of socio-political development as independent agents, and the unprecedented upsurge of the struggle against imperialism—all this is proof that Leninism is historically correct and expresses the fundamental needs of the modern age."*

The creative spirit of Leninism permeates the key political and theoretical propositions formulated in the Meeting's document headed *Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces*. New social phenomena are closely analysed in this and other documents adopted at the Meeting. These phenomena are:

first, the development of the world socialist system, which has entered a period in which it has become possible to make considerably fuller use of its great potentialities;

second, the advance of the scientific and technological revolution, which is opening up unparalleled possibilities for mankind but is running against capitalism, which seeks to use science and technology to prolong its existence at the price of the hardship and suffering of the people;

third, the intensification of the state-monopoly character of modern imperialism, and the aggravation of the contradictions between labour and capital, between the financial oligarchy and the interests not only of the working class—the main driving and mobilising force of the revolutionary struggle—but also of the overwhelming majority of the nation;

fourth, the downfall of the colonial system which has substantially weakened the position of imperialism, and the emergence of sovereign national states as a result of the national liberation movement.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 41.

An analysis of the new social phenomena shows that the present stage has greater possibilities for a further advance of the revolutionary and progressive forces. The documents adopted at the Meeting chart an extended, consistent and militant programme of struggle against imperialism, for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The Meeting was a major milestone in strengthening the unity of the Marxist-Leninist Parties on the basis of proletarian internationalism. It dealt a resounding blow at the Right and "Left" revisionists and also at nationalist tendencies in individual contingents of the communist movement.

Ours is the epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism. The participants in the Meeting rightly emphasised that despite the increasing aggressiveness of imperialism and despite the fact that it mobilises vast resources for an armed, political, economic and ideological struggle against socialism and the popular liberation movement, the balance of forces is changing in favour not of imperialism but of the forces of peace, national liberation and socialism. In spite of the difficulties and setbacks of some of its contingents, the world revolutionary movement continues its advance.

As was noted at the Meeting, *"imperialism can neither regain its lost historical initiative nor reverse world development. The main direction of mankind's development is determined by the world socialist system, the international working class, all revolutionary forces"*.*

At the same time, the Communists do not underrate the strength and potentialities of imperialism, which remains a menace to mankind and has by no means become a "paper tiger". As was pointed out at the Meeting itself and in its documents, imperialism has a large military machine, a considerable economic potential and powerful means of influencing the masses ideologically.

Moreover, it must be borne in mind that being forced to adapt itself to the conditions of the struggle between the two systems, state-monopoly capitalism seeks to boost the efficiency of production and increases its allocations for scientific and technological progress. In an endeavour to strengthen their position in the world, the ruling circles of some capitalist powers resort to forming international state-

* Ibid., p. 13.

monopoly associations and aggressive military and political alliances.

While it is no longer able to reverse the wheel of history, imperialism is still capable of causing the peoples enormous suffering and pain, interfering in the affairs of other nations and unleashing military conflicts. The United States of America, the chief imperialist power, has grown particularly aggressive. The serious threat that imperialism might start another global war still hangs over the peoples of the world. The forces of reaction are more and more frequently having recourse to police persecution. They make every effort to limit the democratic gains of the working people and do not shrink from setting up terrorist forms of domination. In some countries imperialism is trying to recover its lost positions by means of military coups and various forms of intervention. Today imperialism is the chief enemy not only of the international working class but of the whole of mankind, and the main obstacle to world progress.

Underlying the predatory, aggressive policy of imperialism is the aspiration to hinder progress at all costs, undermine the positions of socialism, suppress the national liberation movement, block the struggle of the working people of the capitalist countries for peace and democracy, and use every means to hold up the irreversible general crisis and decline of capitalism.

US imperialism is the principal military, political and economic centre of world reaction and the arch-strangler of the freedom of nations.

Half a century ago the founder of the Soviet state convincingly showed the speciousness and untenability of the assertions that US capitalism is "peace-loving" and "progressive". "The idealised democratic republic" of the United States of America, Lenin pointed out, "*proved* in practice to be a form of the most rabid imperialism, of the most shameless oppression and suppression of weak and small nations." US imperialism, in Lenin's words, turned to be "the most savage imperialism, which is throttling the small and weak nations and reinstating reaction all over the world".*

This assessment of US imperialism has been incontrovertibly borne out in our day. The USA has been and remains the largest world exploiter, bulwark of all the anti-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, pp. 189-90.

popular regimes and the main force of imperialist aggression and brigandage.

The reactionary, anti-popular character of US imperialism has manifested itself most distinctly in the aggression against the Vietnamese people. However, US intervention ran into the heroic resistance of the people of Vietnam, who have the support of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, and of all other peace-loving forces in the world.

The war in Vietnam, as was emphasised at the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, is "the most convincing proof of the contradiction between imperialism's aggressive plans and its ability to put these plans into effect. In Vietnam US imperialism, the most powerful of the imperialist partners, is suffering defeat, and this is of historic significance".*

One of the main tasks of the anti-imperialist struggle today is to compel the US imperialists to end the war of aggression in Vietnam and withdraw their armed forces from that country. "True to the principles of proletarian internationalism and in the spirit of fraternal solidarity," states the Appeal *Independence, Freedom and Peace for Vietnam!* adopted by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, "the international communist and working-class movement will continue to render the Vietnamese people all the assistance they require until the final triumph of their just cause. They thereby make a large contribution towards the cause of world peace, the cause of freedom and socialism."**

In order to reinforce the unity of the communist movement and the world anti-imperialist front and raise the struggle against imperialism to a new, higher stage every effort must be made to intensify the struggle against those who seek to split the ranks of the international revolutionary movement.

In this connection the adventurist policies of the present leaders of the Communist Party of China, who have broken with Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism and are trying to split the world communist movement, is evoking the indignation and deep anxiety of Communists throughout the world. These policies are inflicting enormous

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 13.

** *Ibid.*, p. 44.

harm on the international communist movement, the Chinese people and the People's Republic of China.

Policies of this kind cannot succeed. Marxists-Leninists are sure that sooner or later the ideas of scientific socialism will inevitably triumph in China and that the Chinese people will make their contribution to the common struggle of the working people of the whole world against imperialism, for peace, democracy and socialism.

In all their activities Communists are guided by Lenin's injunction that "no matter what the further complications of the struggle may be, no matter what occasional zigzags we may have to contend with (there will be very many of them—we have seen from experience what gigantic turns the history of the revolution has made. . .)—in order not to lose our way in these zigzags, these sharp turns in history",* it is important not to lose the general perspective. For the Communists this general perspective has been and remains the implementation of the world-historic task of remaking the world by revolution in order to deliver mankind for all time to come from exploitation, poverty, hunger, suffering, privation and wars of annihilation, and ensure all peoples with an abundance of material and cultural blessings.

* * *

Under the banner of Leninism, socialism and mankind's social progress have made colossal headway. But the struggle for mankind's future, for the implementation of the great idea of social equality and justice has not ended. Lenin's prediction that the forces of the old world would not quit the stage of history voluntarily is coming true. The old, outworn capitalist system can and must be swept away by the joint efforts of the peoples of the countries building socialism and communism, the proletariat and broad sections of the working masses of the capitalist states, and the peoples fighting to abolish colonial slavery and achieve national independence.

The teaching of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin is an inexhaustible source of inspiration for Communists, for those fighting to destroy reaction and establish peace and socialism. This was underscored at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, in whose Address *Centenary of the Birth*

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, pp. 129-30.

of *Vladimir Ilyich Lenin* it is stated: "Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, to this great international teaching, holds the promise of further successes of the communist movement.

"Communists regard it as their task firmly to uphold the revolutionary principles of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism in the struggle against all enemies, steadfastly to make them a living reality, constantly to develop Marxist-Leninist theory and enrich it on the basis of present experience of waging the class struggle and building socialist society."^{*}

The ideas expounded by Lenin are winning the minds and hearts of millions. True to Lenin's behests, the Communists, supported by the growing internationalist unity of the working class, of all revolutionary liberation and anti-imperialist forces, will do everything in their power to bring to its victorious end the great struggle to establish socialism and communism throughout the world.

^{*} *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 41.*

THE HERITAGE OF LENIN AND PROBLEMS OF THE REVOLUTIONARY WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

V. I. LENIN ON VARIOUS FORMS
OF THE TRANSITION TO SOCIALISM
AND THE MODERN WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

By *WALDECK ROCHET*,
General Secretary, French Communist Party

The centenary of the birth of Lenin is a major ideological and political event.

Along with Marx and Engels, Lenin unquestionably made the greatest contribution towards the liberation of people and nations. With his name is associated the creative enrichment of Marxism in the new historical conditions, the formation of the new type of revolutionary proletarian Party, the victory of the first socialist revolution in 1917 and the building of the new society, which, under his leadership began to be translated from a dream into reality.

It goes without saying that in all countries of the world the centenary of Lenin's birth is an occasion to pay a further tribute of profound respect to Lenin the man.

But even more important is the fact that this is a further occasion to review his teaching, demonstrate its unfading vitality and show that by its very essence it inspires the struggle waged by our contemporaries: those who are already building the new, socialist society and those, as in France, who are compelled to combat capitalism and its state.

* * *

Capitalism or socialism: such is the alternative determining the life of many countries, including France. The might and attractive force of socialism characterise the epoch in which we live. In vain does M. J.-J. Servan-Schreiber im-

press upon the French working class that it has nothing to do with revolution because it belongs to the "generation of the epoch of computers": the French worker is sick of seeing the fruits of his working day at the factory, whether operated or not by computer, used for the upkeep of the idle and rich, of the capitalist class. The worker knows that by appropriating surplus value capitalism exploits him in the literal sense of the word. The worker aspires to socialism, for this system, under which he will at last work for himself and society, consists of working people like himself.

The impact of socialist ideas in the world is such that today we see the agents of capitalism compelled to don the garments of pseudo-Socialists and give themselves out for "revolutionaries".

Today when pseudo-Socialists of all hues maintain they can build socialism without affecting monopoly and capitalist ownership, it is necessary more than ever before to remind people of the aims of socialism as they were defined by the founders of scientific socialism—Marx, Engels and Lenin.

It is not enough to destroy capitalist society. We must know how to replace it and with what.

More than anybody else, we Communists criticise present-day society, but at the same time we fight to replace it with a better society, with socialist society.

While the reformists and Right opportunists hold that there is no need for a socialist revolution and rest content with partial reforms without calling in question capitalist rule itself, some Leftist groups declare that they are for self-administration at factory level but forget to raise the question of to whom the means of production and state power must belong on the national scale.

Yet in order that one fine day the working people could take over factory management in one or another form the principal means of production must cease being the private property of the capitalists and, consequently, political power must pass into the hands of the working class and its allies.

In order to launch and really achieve the socialist reorganisation of society, the bourgeois state must be in fact replaced by a new, socialist state, i.e., by the state which the founders of scientific socialism called the "temporary dictatorship of the proletariat", the word "dictatorship" meaning political hegemony, leadership of society.

"Socialism," states the Manifesto of the French Communist

Party, "is collective ownership of the basic means of production and exchange, the implementation of political power by the working class and its allies, the progressive satisfaction of the steadily growing material and intellectual requirements of the members of society, and the creation of the necessary conditions for the florescence of every individual."*

Capitalism's apologists try to use the difficulties in the socialist countries in order to hinder the spread of socialist ideas in the world. Some of these difficulties are of an objective nature and spring from historical factors, others are subjective and are due to errors and to the fact that people have not yet learned to make use of all the possibilities inherent in the socialist system. But the circumstance that one or another socialist country has run into difficulties is no reason for underrating the great achievements of the socialist countries, particularly of the Soviet Union. It should not be forgotten that only socialism made it possible to put an end to exploitation of man by man on which the capitalist system is founded.

* * *

Socialism became a scientific doctrine in the mid-19th century, and the October Revolution of 1917 in Russia was the first in which the Marxist teaching was used as a guide.

The immense significance of the socialist revolution of October 1917 and of the Soviet Union's experience is that they proved that the working class is capable of overthrowing capitalism and building a socialist society free of the exploitation of man by man.

The October Revolution laid bare the main universal laws of the socialist revolution. In the Declaration adopted by the 1957 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties these laws were formulated as follows:

conquest of political power by the working class in alliance with the majority of the peasants and other strata of working people;

establishment of a dictatorship of the proletariat in one form or another, understanding this to mean the leadership of society by the working class and its allies and the spread of democracy to all working people, to the whole nation;

abolition of capitalist ownership, the establishment of

* *L'Humanité*, December 7, 1968.

social ownership of the basic means of production and the gradual socialist reorganisation of agriculture;

the building up of a planned socialist economy aimed at securing a steady rise of the people's standard of living, and active participation of the masses in the direction and administration of affairs;

solidarity of the working class of the given country with the working class of other countries;

need for a Marxist-Leninist Party as the genuine revolutionary vanguard of the working class.

At once, in 1917, the followers of reformism and the leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties of different countries adopted a hostile attitude towards the October Socialist Revolution, holding that the road chosen by Lenin for the abolition of capitalism and the building of socialism was wrong because it had cost much too dear.

By coming out with assertions of this kind they made a mistake that was all the more serious in view of the fact that they were subsequently unable to accomplish socialist changes or, at least, start them in any country.

Wilson's Labour Cabinet in Britain and the Socialist Parties which have been in power in the Scandinavian countries for nearly three decades have not attacked the bourgeois monopoly of the basic means of production. They have left representatives of the capitalist oligarchy in their old posts, and today the masses are showing their dissatisfaction with the current policy by refusing confidence to Socialist governments and voting for conservative parties, as has happened in Norway and Denmark.

By trying to adapt the working-class movement to the demands of capitalism and reconcile the working class to the bourgeoisie, the leaders of the Social-Democratic Right wing have, in effect, abandoned their intention to build socialism.

In the different countries this political collapse cannot help but set thinking activists and rank-and-file Socialists who are devoted to socialist ideals and are anxious to find new ways to socialism. The ways that have been followed so far by the Social-Democratic Parties do not lead to socialism. That is a fact.

* * *

However, by relying completely on the general principles of the socialist revolution, one can and must foresee a

different path of advance towards socialism than those which Russia and other countries had been forced to take. In the Declaration of the Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties it is unequivocally stressed that the general principles of the socialist revolution and socialist construction are implemented in different ways in each country, depending on the historical conditions and the national specifics.

In other words, while the transition to socialism is an historical necessity, the conditions and forms of this transition have differed and will differ in each individual country.

Indeed, each country has its own—high or low—economic and cultural level, its own specific alignment of class forces and its own political traditions, in other words, its own national specific.

Moreover, national factors cannot be examined in isolation from the general situation in the world. How smoothly the transition to socialism can be accomplished in a given country depends on whether the international situation favours the forces of progress or reaction.

Hence, it follows that the methods and ways of transition to socialism are extremely diverse. At a meeting in Amsterdam on September 8, 1872 Karl Marx said: "The worker will some day have to win political supremacy. . . .

"But we have by no means affirmed that this goal would be achieved by identical means."*

As regards Lenin, he constantly returned to the thought that the socialist revolution could not be oriented on one and only one example. "All nations," he wrote, "will arrive at socialism—this is inevitable, but all will do so in not exactly the same way, each will contribute something of its own to some form of democracy, to some variety of the dictatorship of the proletariat, to the varying rate of socialist transformations in the different aspects of social life."**

At different stages the French Communist Party has endeavoured to enlarge on these conclusions of the founders of scientific socialism. For instance, directly after the Second World War, when the democratic movement was on the upswing and the forces of the big bourgeoisie were experiencing a decline, thus bearing out the importance of united ac-

* Marx and Engels, *Selected Works* in 3 vols., Vol. II, Moscow, 1969, p. 292.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, pp. 69-70.

tion by all contingents of the working class, Maurice Thorez stated in his famous interview for *The Times* on November 18, 1946 that "the progress of democracy throughout the world, in spite of rare exceptions which serve only to confirm the rule, permits the choice of other paths to socialism than the one taken by the Russian Communists. In any case, the path is necessarily different for each country. We have always thought and said that the French people, who are rich in great traditions, would find for themselves their way to greater democracy, progress, and social justice. Yet, history shows there is no progress without a struggle. There is no well-paved road along which mankind may advance without toil and sweat. There have always been many obstacles to overcome. That is the very sense of life."*

True, at the time the stand adopted by the French Communists was criticised by some fraternal Parties. Besides, the situation in the international communist movement, due to the beginning of the cold war, did not make it possible fully to effectuate the prospect that had taken shape. However, our Party has not abandoned it.

In mentioning the Scandinavian countries, we pointed out that socialism presupposes a fundamental remaking of the country's political face, and that becoming the leading class the proletariat acts in alliance with the working peasants and the middle urban strata. Socialism represents a qualitative leap in history, and all this is expressed by the concept "socialist revolution".

Does this revolution necessarily have to be accomplished in the form of a military clash, of a civil war between the opposing forces? This apocalyptic image of the socialist revolution superbly serves the interests and calculations of the adversaries of progress, but it does not mirror the standpoint of the Communists.

* * *

After the 20th Congress of the CPSU, in the joint Statements of the Communist and Workers' Parties of 1957 and 1960 it was stressed that more propitious conditions for the triumph of socialism had appeared as a consequence of the far-reaching and radical changes that had taken place in favour of socialism.

* *The Times*, November 18, 1946, p. 6.

"The forms of the transition from capitalism to socialism may vary for different countries. The working class and its vanguard—the Marxist-Leninist Party—seek to achieve the socialist revolution by peaceful means. This would accord with the interests of the working class and the entire people, with the national interests of the country.

"Today in a number of capitalist countries the working class headed by its vanguard has the opportunity, given a united working-class and popular front or other workable forms of agreement and political co-operation between the different parties and public organisations, to unite a majority of the people, win state power without civil war and ensure the transfer of the basic means of production to the hands of the people. . . .

"All this will be possible only by broad and ceaseless development of the class struggle of the workers, peasant masses and the urban middle strata against big monopoly capital, against reaction, for profound social reforms, for peace and socialism.

"In the event of the exploiting classes resorting to violence against people, the possibility of non-peaceful transition to socialism should be borne in mind. Leninism teaches, and experience confirms, that the ruling classes never relinquish power voluntarily. In this case the degree of bitterness and the forms of the class struggle will depend not so much on the proletariat as on the resistance put up by the reactionary circles to the will of the overwhelming majority of the people, or these circles using force at one or another stage of the struggle for socialism."*

We wholeheartedly subscribe to these theses, which relate to the various forms that the struggle for the transition to socialism can take.

We believe that the French big bourgeoisie will make a desperate stand in order to preserve its position after the majority of the nation has declared itself in favour of socialist reforms.

However, we consider that in the struggle for socialism, provided it pursues a correct policy, the working class in our country has the possibility of uniting round itself the bulk of the working people and of the middle strata and thereby, at

* *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1961, pp. 18-19.

a definite moment, ensuring a huge superiority of forces capable of paralysing the bourgeoisie's tendency to resort to civil war and discouraging it from using weapons.

In their assessments the French Communists also take into account the fact that capitalism is no longer able to dictate its will to the world. However, peaceful transition remains a possibility but not a firm reality, and it will therefore be necessary to take the specific situation into consideration.

* * *

Although Marxist theory maintains that in all cases the transition to socialism represents a qualitative reorganisation of society, i.e., revolution, it does not offer a ready-made pattern of the forms and means of struggle which the working class and its allies must employ in order to win political power and successfully consummate socialist reforms.

On this point Lenin said that to act in a Marxist, revolutionary way meant to adopt a creative, scientific approach which took the specific historical circumstances into consideration. On the problem of the forms of struggle he wrote: "In the first place, Marxism differs from all primitive forms of socialism by not binding the movement to any one particular form of struggle.... Under no circumstances does Marxism confine itself to the forms of struggle that, unknown to the participants of the given period, *inevitably* arise as the given social situation changes....

"In the second place, Marxism demands an absolutely *historical* examination of the question of the forms of struggle. To treat this question apart from the concrete historical situation betrays a failure to understand the rudiments of dialectical materialism."*

For us Lenin is a model revolutionary, who, in determining the tactics of struggle and the political objective, always proceeded from the real state of affairs at the given moment, from the specific situation and from the possibilities springing from that situation.

In face of the all-powerful, barbarous tsarist autocracy, in the exceedingly difficult conditions of an extremely backward country, many Russian revolutionaries had often taken desperate decisions. They pinned their hopes exclusively on

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, pp. 213-14.

the struggle of lone persons or of small isolated groups, on a courageous but futile struggle because the masses were not involved in it.

Considering the futility of this sort of action, Lenin, who was only a youth at the time, decided to find a different road for the socialist revolution.

This was the road of building up a genuinely proletarian Party whose programme, forms and tactics of struggle, organisational principles and cadres conformed to the requirements of living reality. Lenin sought to activate the working class as the main force. As a result of capitalist development the working class was growing numerically and gathering strength. Furthermore, Lenin mapped out a plan under which the struggle of the working class was to be reinforced by the actions of broad masses of peasants and the struggle of the non-Russian peoples against national oppression, from which they suffered in the tsarist empire. He thus moved to the forefront the struggle of the masses and the unity of the democratic forces. Even under these conditions he kept emphasising since 1899 that the "working class would, of course, prefer to take power *peacefully*".* But brutal violence by tsarism directed Russia's history to a different road.

* * *

In Russia Soviets emerged during the revolution of 1905, in which mass political strikes were combined with armed action. When tsarism collapsed in February 1917, at the height of the war, the Soviets reappeared and became a form of power coexisting with the bourgeois Provisional Government.

That was when Lenin advanced the slogan "All power to the Soviets" in order to put an end to capitalist rule and secure the transition to socialism.

He pointed out that in the conditions obtaining in Russia the transfer of state power to the Soviets and the transition from capitalism to socialism could be effected peacefully. Indeed, had the parties which declared themselves adherents of socialism, for example, the Mensheviks, desired like the Bolsheviks to use the favourable conditions for removing the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 276.

bourgeoisie from power, the experience of Russia would have differed from the experience which was actually gained by force of circumstances.

In the Soviets, as organs of power, there would have been a political struggle between the Socialist and democratic parties. The parties winning the majority would have formed the majority in the Government. The revolution would have developed under conditions witnessing the existence of several Soviet parties and a peaceful struggle for socialism. But the Mensheviks and the Socialist-Revolutionaries had no faith in the possibility of a socialist revolution in Russia.

Instead of co-operating with the Bolsheviks (Communists), they did not hesitate in July 1917, under the aegis of the Kerensky Government, to launch bloody repressions against them and this, somewhat later, in October, led to a military clash.

The Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries did not desire to co-operate with the Bolshevik Party, whose influence in the Soviets—in other words, among the worker and peasant masses—was growing not by the day but by the hour.

This was the situation in which the October uprising of 1917 took place under the leadership of the Leninist Party, and Soviet power was established—almost without bloodshed—in the course of a few days.

Several months later, backed by the armed intervention of the Western capitalist powers, the internal counter-revolution started a civil war. The struggle was so violent and destructive that it could not but leave a deep imprint on the new state.

Lenin repeatedly stressed the entire depth of its effects to the young Soviet power from the economic, political, moral and cultural aspects. The war embraced the entire country and for a long time made the functioning of Soviet democracy practically impossible. This was an extremely serious circumstance for a country with autocratic traditions.

Moreover, the situation did not make it possible to establish durable co-operation between the Bolshevik and other parties. Co-operation between the Bolsheviks and the Left Socialist-Revolutionaries, started on Government level in December 1917, rapidly disintegrated through the fault of the latter.

Having triumphantly consolidated its right to existence, the Soviet Government had to embark on the building of the new, socialist system in one country. The country was huge, of course, but it was dislocated economically and surrounded on all sides by the hostile capitalist world. That is what determines the historical grandeur of the Soviet experience, and, also, some of its specific features. Consequently, when we analyse this experience we have to distinguish in it features of socialism that are of universal significance and also features intrinsic to the Soviet Union.

Having established the basic principles of the socialist revolution, the October Revolution at the same time facilitated the transformation of the world and the change of the balance of power to the extent that now, thanks to the dedication and heroism of the first builders of socialism in Russia, it is possible to move towards the new society by a road different from that of the October Revolution.

* * *

Immediately after the October Revolution Lenin declared that the Russian Marxists had been triumphant because they had freed themselves from opportunism and dogmatism. In "*Left-Wing*" Communism—an *Infantile Disorder* he insisted that Communists of the capitalist world should make every effort to learn "to apply the general and basic principles of communism ... to the *specific features* in the objective development towards communism, which are different in each country and which we must be able to discover, study and predict".*

The newly formed Communist Parties did not at once appreciate the significance of this injunction. Many stereotype ideas, for example that the Soviets were the only form of working-class power in all countries, became current.

Dogmatism was dealt a crushing blow at the Seventh Congress of the Communist International in 1935. The French Communist Party's creative policy and its initiative in setting up the Popular Front were highly appraised at that congress. The report, delivered by Georgi Dimitrov, blasted the view that the road traversed by the Russian Communists had to be repeated in every detail.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 89.

Take the Vietnamese people. They won independence in North Vietnam in armed struggle against the French colonialists, and today they are winning it in the South in struggle against the US aggressor.

In Latin America the Cuban people also won liberation from imperialism in an armed struggle in order to choose the socialist road of development.

An armed struggle and partisan action combined with other forms of struggle and popular movements may prove to be really necessary in one country or another in order to put an end to a military or fascist dictatorship serving US imperialism.

But this does not at all mean that the armed struggle is the only form of struggle in all countries, in all continents and in all periods.

While it is true that no real revolution developing on national soil can isolate itself behind national exclusiveness and divorce itself from the socialist camp, it is similarly true that no revolution and no revolutionary tactics are items of standardised export.

If in one country or another the alignment of class forces is unfavourable, an armed struggle may lead the movement to defeat and even to disaster by giving reaction cause for starting repressions.

That is exactly what happened in Indonesia in 1965: carried away by Leftist theses about an "armed struggle everywhere", some leaders of the Communist Party of Indonesia, jointly with a group of progressive officers, made an attempt to remove reactionary generals heading the Indonesian Army by means of an armed action, through a putsch.

This attempt was undertaken in a situation in which the masses knew nothing of what was taking place, despite the fact that Lenin taught that revolution must be a matter of the masses themselves. For that reason the attempt failed, and everybody knows the result: their hands untied, the reactionary forces exterminated more than 300,000 Communists and rendered leaderless a Party that had 2,500,000 members. The masses of Indonesia found themselves unable to take any effective action.

This and other examples show that "Left" adventurism, which insists on an armed struggle "everywhere" and "at any time", can inflict enormous harm on the revolutionary movement.

Ultimately it is the Communist Party in each country that has to decide on when to go over to specific action and determine the most expedient forms of struggle which would take the situation, the national features and the available possibilities into account.

The "Left" opportunists ignore the obvious fact that in a highly developed country like France, democratic and socialist tasks intertwine.

In the present situation and under the obtaining alignment of forces the struggle for advanced democracy, i.e., for far-reaching social reforms, allows making the best use of the revolutionary anti-monopoly potentialities of all the democratic forces and mobilising the energy not only of the proletariat and working peasants but of broad segments of the intelligentsia who realise that social changes are necessary.

We shall, therefore, continue to follow the line charted by our 18th Congress, displaying steadily increasing initiative and activity in all spheres.

It is only the growing, determined and faith-guided activity of every organisation and every member of our Party that can ensure the spread of the French Communist Party's influence among the masses, among all anti-monopoly sections of the population, i.e., at every concrete enterprise, in every village, in every university, in every laboratory and research centre, and in every section of our towns.

It goes without saying that to make the struggle against "Left" opportunism effective we have to fight with similar energy against Right-opportunist distortions of our principles and policy.

A manifestation of Right opportunism is the trend to concentrate all attention on current problems, overlooking the fact that our end goal is socialism.

Whatever specific problems draw the attention of the French Communist Party, its main line is that the struggle for immediate demands should not overshadow the socialist perspective. On the contrary, it should facilitate the advance towards the new society, help to secure that objective and show the masses that socialism is superior to capitalism and that it is necessary to fight for it.

The necessary flexibility in the policy pursued by the Party, which seeks the surest way of advancing towards socialism, a way conforming best of all with the spirit of

the times, quite naturally combines with the most profound respect for fundamental principles and with unshakeable fidelity to the end goals of the revolutionary working-class movement.

Marxism-Leninism insists on unity of principles and flexible tactics, a unity which protects us simultaneously against Right revisionism and "Left" doctrinairism.

Hence the need to continue and intensify our ideological struggle in order to interpret key current problems correctly.

The objective conditions for the transition to socialism have matured in present-day France. The problem facing our country today is to free the productive forces and use them for the welfare of society as a whole by removing the conflict between these forces and the social system and breaking the fetters in which they have been confined by capitalism.

The influence of socialist ideas is spreading chiefly because socialism has ceased being a dream or only a scientific prevision.

It has been proved through experience that the socialist mode of production, which puts an end to exploitation of man by man, is feasible. It ensures the rapid growth of the productive forces and the steady rise of the people's standard of living and cultural level.

That is why, despite existing difficulties, more and more Frenchmen are perceiving the direction in which history is moving.

The aspiration for socialism has gained strength in the working class and it has won the minds of broad sections of the intelligentsia, technical specialists and peasants. Many people are quite naturally, therefore, pondering over the question of the prospects of socialism in France. In this connection it would be particularly *à propos* to deal broadly with the forms and content of the new system.

* * *

In their Rules and basic programmes the Communist and Socialist Parties use almost identical terms to state that their aim is to abolish social classes and put an end to the exploitation of one class by another through the socialisation of the basic means of production and exchange and also through capitalist society's reorganisation into collectivist

or, in other words, communist society. But differences come to the fore over the ways and means of achieving the transition from capitalism to socialism.

In this connection we have shown that thanks to the victory of the October Revolution and the building of socialism in a number of countries, new conditions and possibilities for co-operation between the Communists and Socialists have arisen in a country like France.

However, for many years this co-operation in the struggle for democracy and socialism could not be effectuated because of the Socialist Party's policy of conciliation with the bourgeoisie.

Indeed, it will be recalled after the Communist Ministers were removed from the Ramadier Government in 1947 the Socialist Party co-operated for many years with the Right-wing parties and, in the beginning, even with the first de Gaulle Government in 1958.

However, in subsequent years the policy of the Socialist Party underwent some evolution. From 1965 onwards there has been a steady convergence of the Communists and Socialists in the struggle against the personal power regime. The most prominent leaders of the Socialist Party repeatedly stated their intention of drawing certain conclusions from what was taking place in Great Britain, Italy and the Scandinavian countries, and also from their own past experience. They spoke of their unwillingness to return to the Government on terms as poor as those that were frequently conceded in the past, i.e., in coalition with the Right-wing forces.

"It must be remembered once and for all," stated an editorial in *Le Populaire*, "that this possibility is ruled out for us. Our Party has drawn lessons from its own experience and has no intention of returning to the road which in the last analysis does not serve the cause of socialism."*

Regrettably, subsequent events showed that the Socialist Party has been unable to break with past routine.

The powerful mass movement of May-June 1968 failed to yield a positive political result chiefly because the leaders of the Socialist Party turned down our Communist Party's proposal for agreement on the basis of a joint Government programme.

* *Le Populaire de Paris*, February 20-21, 1968.

Continuing this pernicious line at the Presidential elections in June 1969, the Socialist Party did not accept our proposal for an agreement on the basis of a common democratic programme and on the nomination of a single Left candidate. Instead, it unilaterally put forward its own candidate, thereby splitting the Left forces and benefitting reaction.

But this candidate suffered an overwhelming defeat, while the candidate of the French Communist Party scored a notable success.

Through their votes millions of working people and democrats thus expressed their desire for an unequivocal and honest alliance between the workers and the democratic forces.

It was again proved that reaction cannot be removed from power and that a policy of genuine social advancement cannot triumph and no progress towards socialism achieved without the participation of the Communists, without united action by the Communists and Socialists, without bringing together all the workers and progressive forces in the country.

That is why, despite the new obstacles that have been erected on the road to unity, the French Communist Party, which draws its strength from the trust reposed in it by broad sections of the people, will multiply its efforts to win working people and active Socialists to the cause of working-class unity. This is an indispensable condition for the victory of socialism.

* * *

As regards the transition to socialism in France, our 17th and 18th congresses adopted new theses founded on the general laws of the socialist revolution and on the specific conditions obtaining in France today.

Guided by these new theses, the Party's Manifesto, adopted at Champigny, clearly sets forth the entire range of conditions that could make the transition to socialism by peaceful means, i.e., without civil war, possible in a country like ours. However, this by no means signifies that this transition is accomplished without a bitter class struggle.

Indeed, when we examine the possibility for a peaceful transition to socialism we do not regard it in isolation from the powerful mass movement.

On this point our Manifesto declares that the peaceful road to socialism should not be confused with the parliamentary road.

Unquestionably, the Communist Party by no means underrates work in various elective organs or the role that can be played by a parliament consisting of deputies favouring democracy and socialism.

But the Party holds that to effect the transition to socialism there first have to be numerous mass actions by the working class and broad social strata opposed to monopoly rule, because this is the way in which the alignment of social and political forces can be changed in favour of democracy and socialism.

In other words, the peaceful transition to socialism does not imply the absence of struggle. It is a road of class struggle in all its forms except civil war.

If the peaceful development of the revolution becomes possible, it will by no means be due to the ruling class, the bourgeoisie, having changed its nature and being prepared to relinquish power voluntarily, but to the fact that the new conditions will allow the working class to win the majority of the nation over to its side, i.e., to achieve such a superiority of strength that the bourgeoisie, finding itself isolated, will be unable to resort to civil war. However, although we would prefer the peaceful road, we must not lose sight of the fact that the bourgeoisie will resort to violence against the people. This means that the proletariat and the popular masses will be forced to accept the challenge and ensure the transition to socialism by non-peaceful means.

Naturally, nobody can tell today how the transition to socialism will be accomplished in France, but the French Communists are resolutely working to create conditions favouring the transition to socialism by peaceful means and are bending every effort to win the support of the majority of the nation for the struggle for this prospect.

In any case, we do not forget that whatever the form of the transition to socialism may be—peaceful or non-peaceful—it will demand the militant unity of the working class and the cohesion round it or support of all the democratic and progressive forces. We must fight for this united action and this cohesion already today.

We mentioned that the socialist revolution begins with the conquest of political power by the working class and its allies.

But in order to carry out its historical mission it is important for the working class to end the split in its ranks. The Communists are logically working for complete unity, i.e., for organic unity with their Socialist comrades. Possibly, however, in a country like France, along with the Communist Party there will be a Socialist Party for a long time to come.

It is senseless to expect an integration of the two parties, an integration assuming complete agreement on theoretical and practical questions, in order to begin a struggle for democracy and socialism. The Communists advocate co-operation with the Socialists not only in the present struggle for genuine democracy, but also in the future struggle for the building of socialism. I repeat, the closer and more fruitful this co-operation is, the sooner will the prerequisites take shape for organic unity.

Moreover, the social forces supporting the Communist and the Socialist Parties are not the only ones interested in society's renewal. Even if the organic unity of the two parties acting in the name of the working class takes place, there will not be only one party: alongside the Party of the working class there may exist other democratic parties and organisations representing certain sections of the working people and desiring to co-operate in the building of socialism.

The idea that only one party is needed for the building of socialism clashes with the conditions obtaining in all countries. Besides, a demand of this kind may hold up the advent of socialism by hindering the integration of all socialist and progressive forces.

Such is the case, for example, in a country like ours, where besides the Communist Party there is a large Socialist Party and where co-operation between the Communists and Socialists is an indispensable condition for the earliest achievement of working-class unity and for the cohesion round it of all the country's democratic and progressive forces.

This very desire to facilitate the attainment of working-

class unity and the cohesion of all the democratic forces was expressed by our Party at its 15th Congress in 1959: "The democratic and national rejuvenation of France, in the same way as progress towards socialism, cannot be the affair of one party: they demand an honest and lasting alliance between the working class, the working peasants, the intelligentsia and the urban middle classes. They presuppose an alliance between the Communist and other democratic parties."*

I should like to stress that this standpoint is not exceptional in the international working-class and communist movement. Indeed, in the Declaration adopted by the 1957 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties of the Socialist Countries, it is underlined that Communists adopt a critical attitude towards the ideological positions and Right-opportunist practices of the Social-Democratic Party, but also pointed out that it is necessary to form a united front of Communists and Socialists also in the struggle for power and the building of socialism. The Declaration says: "In the struggle for better conditions for the working people, for preservation and extension of their democratic rights, winning and maintaining national independence and peace among nations, as well as in the struggle for winning power and building socialism, the Communist Parties seek co-operation with the Socialist Parties."**

This basic tenet has been enlarged on at the 17th and 18th congresses of our Party. On this point the Manifesto adopted at Champigny states:

"In the transition to socialism and in the course of socialist construction the existing parties and democratic organisations, which will come out for socialism and abide by the laws of the new social system, will have every possibility to participate in political life and enjoy all the rights and freedoms guaranteed by the Constitution.

"The Communist Party will make every effort to encourage and organise co-operation with all these social and political forces."*** Evidently, it is impossible to create beforehand a rounded-off system of co-operation and alliances in order to go over to socialism in France because this de-

* "XV-e Congrès du Parti communiste français", *Cahiers du communisme*, July-August 1959, p. 535.

** *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, pp. 19-20.

*** *L'Humanité*, December 7, 1968.

depends on national conditions and on the stand at present adopted by the parties and organisations drawn into the class struggle.

When we declare that in a country like ours it is possible to go over to socialism under a multi-party system, it does not mean that socialism can be achieved without a class struggle, without mobilising all the forces of the working class and its allies.

This point is dealt with in the political resolution adopted at our 18th Congress in January 1967 in Levallois-Perret:

"No matter what the form of the transition to socialism, this transition presupposes the conquest of political power by the working class in a close alliance with the working peasants and the urban middle strata."*

For the same reasons this presupposes the existence and activity of a strong Communist Party inspired by Marxist-Leninist principles and firmly supported by the working class. The possibility for building socialism in France depends on whether the French Communist Party is able to play the role of vanguard of the working class in the development of the revolution and in socialist construction.

The revolutionary Party of the working class champions the interests of all working people, of the nation. It unites those who desire to achieve socialism—workers, peasants, office employees and intellectuals.

However, the Communist Party has no intention of usurping this role of vanguard and leader, which it must play in order to fulfil its historic mission of accomplishing the socialist revolution. It desires to win this role, to become worthy of it by displaying the maximum foresight and the maximum devotion to the cause of the people and, above all, in honest competition with all its allies securing unity and co-operation among all the revolutionary forces bent on achieving socialism.

* * *

The task of the new political power—the power of the working class and its allies—is to build the new, socialist economy and the new, socialist society.

* *Cahiers du communisme*, No. 2-3, February-March 1967, Special Issue, p. 570.

The fulfilment of this gigantic and exciting task requires the broad and most active participation of the masses in the administration of social affairs.

Socialism signifies more than deliverance from capitalist exploitation. It signifies the realisation of a democracy superior to any bourgeois democracy.

The premier function of the socialist power is to establish this broadest of democracies for the nation as a whole, for all working people, in order to draw them into the leadership and administration of social affairs in all spheres and at all levels.

Accordingly, the French Communist Party considers that with France's transition to socialism all representative institutions, which are traditional factors in the country's social and political life, must be democratised along with the all-round promotion of all forms of activity by the masses.

Thus, the parliament, which is elected by universal suffrage within the context of the electoral law that ensures authentic representation for the nation, shall become an effective instrument of the popular and national will.

The same concerns the municipal, departmental and regional authorities, whose rights and prerogatives must be extended and guaranteed.

The same applies to the new institutions that will inevitably spring up in the course of the fulfilment of the socio-economic tasks of socialist construction—both on the level of planning national economic, social and cultural development and on the level of individual enterprises.

The role of the mass democratic organisations and their contribution to economic and social life will be intensified and encouraged.

The rights and role of the trade unions in upholding the interests of the people will be enlarged and guaranteed, and they will be assigned an active part in the management of the economy and of enterprises. The independence of these mass organisations will be respected in accordance with the traditions of their development in our country.

At the same time, the anti-democratic institutions serving exclusively big-bourgeois interests in order to safeguard bourgeois class political rule, for example, the institution of prefects, will be swept away.

Continued democratisation of institutions presupposes not

only their preservation and an effective guarantee of their existence, but also an extension of the rights and freedoms won in the course of the long class battles marking the history of our country.

Freedom of thought and speech, freedom of assembly and association, and trade union freedoms and the right to strike will not only be recorded in the Constitution as at present. Socialist democracy will create the conditions allowing all these rights and freedoms to be actually enjoyed within the context of the law, thereby encouraging the initiative of the masses and giving full stature to the personality of every individual.

Inasmuch as under socialism the state, naturally, must be secular and must scrupulously abide by the principle of separating the Church from the State, a socialist France will juridically and in practice guarantee freedom of religious worship against persecution, administrative or otherwise. In the ideological struggle, the Communists intend to win the masses, including people of all religious faiths, over to the side of scientific socialism by the convincing example of socialist achievements, exemplary human qualities and creative collective labour. Socialist legality will eradicate all racial discrimination, all manifestations of anti-Semitism, all incitement to war and all attempts to stir up hatred for one people or another.

Lastly, as the political resolution of the 18th Congress states in its section dealing with the transition to socialism, "the rights of the minority must be implemented within the context of the new legality democratically established by the majority".

* * *

This means that the new political power, the power of the people, guarantees the basic rights of all citizens and, in the interests of the whole nation, ensures the legal protection of the new social system against attack from within and from without. We are fully aware that we shall have to safeguard the new system against sabotage organised by the deposed exploiting classes thirsting to return to power and restore capitalism.

A question of paramount importance is whether the working class of France and its allies will be able to build socialism if, upon winning political power by democratic

means, they leave the exponents of capitalism, the enemies of socialism, the possibility of using all means, including violence, for undermining socialist reorganisation and restoring the exploitation of man by man.

We hold the view that the power of the people and the building of socialism must be safeguarded and upheld within the context of socialist legality by all the democratic parties and organisations which are for socialism and represent the majority of the people.

For that reason the law of the majority must apply to everybody and must be respected by everybody.

"Insofar as it is possible," states the Party Manifesto, "the working class will always give preference not to measures of compulsion but to measures of persuasion and education. But it will not hesitate to use compulsion if the forces hostile to socialism will themselves resort to subversive activity and violence" to destroy socialism and, with it, democracy.*

The expropriated monopolists—former members of the financial oligarchy, ex-presidents, the general directors of trusts and banks, the handful of political swindlers and the top-level technocrats, who ensured the dictatorship of the capitalists—will have the right to live but will have no right to plot, stir up counter-revolution, enlist mercenaries and make deals with foreign capitalists. Their position will depend on what stand they adopt.

The defenders of capitalism are, quite naturally, extremely anxious to preserve the maximum means for perpetuating their inhuman exploiting system. But from this it also follows that the supporters of socialism must make every effort to achieve the maximum unity of their forces in order to put an end to the capitalist system and build a more just and more fraternal society by democratic means.

Communists clearly see the need for limited compulsion in cases where the minority threatens the democratic cause of the majority. In all cases where opinions do not coincide, free and open discussion on all problems with the broadest possible participation of the masses must be regarded as an essential element of progress.

As a matter of fact, the majority may also have differences over the methods of building socialism. Essential distinctions

* *L'Humanité*, December 7, 1968.

will exist for quite a long time between the social classes. These distinctions disappear gradually. There will be certain distinctions in the ideological and political mood of citizens.

The utility of co-operation between parties advocating socialist democracy is self-evident. They have to work out decisions that would be acceptable to all of them, and clashes will give way to discussion and reasonable compromises. In cases where no compromise can be found, the majority will adopt a decision in accordance with the democratic rule, and the minority will have to abide by this decision. But the majority will act in such a way as to win to its side representatives of different opinions not by compulsion but by persuasion. Compulsion is used only against those whose actions go beyond the pale of legality.

This twin aspect of the new political power of the working people—constant promotion of democracy for all working people, for the nation as a whole, and the defence of socialist gains against the deposed exploiting classes—characterises what the founders of Marxism called the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lastly, it must be stressed that the dictatorship of the proletariat is of a temporary, transient nature, because the building of socialism, which it is called upon to guarantee, is directed towards the abolition of antagonistic classes and the establishment of rule by the whole people.

* * *

It is necessary to comment on the inevitability of capitalist society's transformation into socialist society after the working class and its allies come to power.

First, the new relations will be established by stages and in various ways. For instance, there can be no question of the nationalisation of small and medium peasant farms. Here the only answer is provided by co-operatives of the most diverse types, depending on the degree of integration.

This free transition to co-operative production may be achieved only as a result of persuasion and only when it is decided on by the peasants themselves. In all cases membership in co-operatives is voluntary. Today there is no shortage in countries building socialism like, for example, Poland, where there are considerably more individual farms than collective farms.

The small and middle peasants of our country face the alternative of breaking down with exhaustion and perishing on the hopeless capitalist road or taking the socialist road of development in order to survive.

Those small and middle peasant farms that continue to follow the capitalist road are in most cases doomed to fall into decay and disappear because of the shortage of farm machinery, the discrepancy between the prices for farm products and manufactured goods, and the crushing debts incurred through the purchase of implements, whose cost can never be recovered. The capitalist road signifies the proletarianisation of the peasant and a growing difference between the standard of living in town and countryside.

Socialism frees the peasants from the capitalist monopolies in wholesale trade and also from the domination of the big landowners. It guarantees land to those who till it and helps the peasants to form co-operatives on a voluntary basis. In addition to increasing incomes, the socialist co-operative gives the peasants a limited working day and paid leaves for the first time in history.

The working conditions and living standard of the French peasants will reach the urban level. The socialist way will thus bring about a gradual erasure of the distinction between town and countryside. This is desired by all the working peasants.

The agricultural co-operative has, of course, already made some headway, but it flourishes in all its forms only under a socialist economy and with the aid of the state. The working peasants can be fully emancipated only by socialism.

Today in artisan production and in small-scale trade there is unrest on account of concentration, which is intensifying as a result of co-ordinated action by the monopolies and the state. The income tax weighs more and more heavily on the small traders and artisans working under contract. The enlargement of the sphere in which TAV—tax on additional value*—operates has also been designed in the interests of big commerce.

In face of this danger the more far-sighted people of

* Additional value is formed by the movement and sale of goods to consumers and by services to consumers. Until 1968 the tax operated only with regard to the big trade monopolies. In 1968 it was extended to cover small shopkeepers and artisans with the result that their ability to compete has been sharply diminished.—*Ed.*

these professional categories have begun to look for ways of achieving modernisation in order to survive, and of protecting themselves in the competition with the big stores, the super-markets and so on. Some years ago this too led to the development of co-operatives. In 1966 there were in France 120 artisan co-operatives, while tens of thousands of small shopkeepers organised themselves in trade co-operatives and associations.

Although the co-operatives have gained in scope in retail trade and small-scale production, their development is held in check by the government's economic and fiscal policy, which promotes the interests chiefly of the monopolies.

Genuine socialist democracy, free of monopoly domination, will treat the urban petty bourgeoisie quite differently. Larger salaries would encourage initiative. A tax reform would make the position of these social groups simpler and easier. At the same time, the co-operatives would have the support of the state.

In the period of transition to socialism, under socialist democracy, the small shopkeepers and artisans would retain their place in the economy.

Of great interest in this connection is the experience of the German Democratic Republic. There the artisans gradually united in co-operatives and their production was included in the national economic development plan. The GDR has thus pioneered a unique solution of the problem of retail trade, creating for the small and medium enterprises, whose nationalisation is out of the question, a new system of mixed enterprises with the participation of the socialist state.

There are in the GDR 139,020 private artisan enterprises employing a total of 364,798 workers, 4,096 private enterprises with up to 100 employees, and 5,512 mixed enterprises and 4,235 artisan producers' co-operatives employing 212,000 persons (statistics for 1966).

This shows that private initiative can play a positive role in the socialist economy.

We have shown that monopoly capitalism has disrupted the unity of the bourgeoisie. At present the oligarchy's policy raises the question of the life and death not only of small but also of medium capitalist enterprises that are still independent. Under modern conditions the only course open to them is to disappear or lose their economic independence.

Big capital does not remove all small firms. On the contrary, it allows many of them to survive provided they are totally dependent on it.

Hence the fostering of the system of subcontracts under modern capitalism. Contracts do not guarantee the safety and stability of small and medium enterprises that find themselves dependent on a trust, because the trust can annul its orders at any moment and doom the subcontractors to bankruptcy. It subordinates them to a tyrannical discipline. It would be sinister irony to speak of "free enterprise" under these conditions.

Consequently, for the small and medium enterprises there is a course other than monopoly integration and unconditional submission to big capital, or becoming a preserve of the giant enterprises which use them when the market is favourable and annul orders during crises—this course is to co-operate within the framework of a socialist state. Economic integration with the nationalised sector, and specialisation and modernisation with state assistance could enable the small and medium enterprises to maintain their juridical independence.

We have cited the example of the GDR because we take the conditions in our country into consideration and attach great importance to the form of co-operation between the working class, the independent working people and the small entrepreneurs during the period of transition from capitalism to socialism.

* * *

Such are the socialist prospects opening before present-day France: the possibility of achieving a democratic transition to the new system through co-operation between the parties and organisations advocating socialism, broad socialist democracy and diversity and flexibility of the forms of collective appropriation.

On what does the realisation of these prospects depend? Essentially, on two conditions.

The first is the fostering of the popular movement. Consequently, the future of France depends primarily on the work that the adherents of socialism, chiefly the Communists, will be able to accomplish in order to win the majority of the people and help them to organise for the revolutionary struggle.

The second condition largely depends on the other organisations coming out for socialism, particularly the Socialist Party. Indeed, the transition to socialism by peaceful or non-peaceful means does not depend solely on the wishes and activity of the Communist Party.

Other parties and organisations that declare themselves in favour of socialism have to renounce the policy of class co-operation with the big capitalist bourgeoisie in order, side by side with the Communists, to pursue a policy of effective struggle for democracy and socialism.

However that may be, our Communist Party has adopted a clear-cut stand: it considers that its cardinal task is to attract the working masses and all opponents of capitalism to the ideal of socialism and to the struggle to achieve that ideal.

The French Communist Party has always stated openly that it is a revolutionary Party that fights to put an end to capitalism and achieve the transition to socialism through the conquest of political power by the working class and its allies. Its aim is to build socialism. We make no allowance, as do the self-satisfied Left opportunists, for what Jaurès called the "almost mystical expectation of a liberative catastrophe". We know that true strength lies in increasingly broader unity and increasingly planned day-to-day actions, in direct action, whose immediate aim today is to abolish personal power and establish advanced democracy.

By fighting today for the promotion of democracy in the economic and political spheres and pressing for united action by all working-class, democratic and progressive forces, we prepare the masses for a more direct struggle for socialism and accomplish revolutionary work.

Indeed, it is only in the joint struggle of the working class and broad strata of the population for steadily broader economic and social reforms and the overthrow of monopoly rule that the majority of the people can, thanks to the resultant higher level of political consciousness, realise that a fundamental solution of our epoch's problems can only be found in the socialist reorganisation of society.

Our current fight for advanced democracy is part and parcel of our general struggle for a socialist France.

We want power not in order to pursue the policy of the monopolies or in some way patch up capitalism.

As distinct from the mercurial petty-bourgeois elements,

who parade revolutionism in words, we treat the question of the socialist revolution seriously and make every effort to find ways that could surely lead to socialism in conformity with the conditions obtaining in our times and in our country.

To work for the victory of socialism does not mean to bandy loud words. It means to act in the real situation in order to win the majority of the people over to the side of socialism. To act in this way is to be a revolutionary in present-day France. That is why the French Communist Party is a great revolutionary Party of France in the finest sense of the word.

For that reason it is also a great national Party. To fight for socialism in France means to fight not only for the emancipation of the working class but also for the country's highest interests, for a free, peaceful and flourishing France.

* * *

Being a scientific world outlook, Marxism is a guide to action.

As all sciences, it lives and develops. It is being constantly enriched with the results of theoretical research, the experience of the class struggle of the working people, and the achievements of countries where socialism has triumphed. It is not a dogmatically immobile science with stereotyped formulas and mummified propositions. Marxism draws its vitality from a constant comparison of doctrines and facts. In a letter written in 1868 Marx castigated those who fell into the same mistake as Proudhon, who, "instead of looking among the existing elements of the class movement for the real basis of his agitation, wanted to prescribe the course to be followed by this movement according to a certain doctrinaire recipe".*

Lenin shared Marx's point of view. In 1899 he wrote: "We do not regard Marx's theory as something completed and inviolable; on the contrary, we are convinced that it has only laid the foundation stone of the science which Socialists *must* develop in all directions if they wish to keep pace with life. We think that an *independent* elaboration of Marx's theory is especially essential for Russian Socialists;

* Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 214.

for this theory provides only general *guiding* principles, which, *in particular*, are applied in England differently than in France, in France differently than in Germany, and in Germany differently than in Russia.”*

Lenin enlarged on the teaching of Marx in the light of the new conditions that took shape in the world early in the 20th century, namely the replacement of capitalism of free competition by monopoly capitalism. He creatively elaborated on some Marxist propositions. Marx and Engels believed that the socialist revolution would take place more or less at one and the same time in all the leading capitalist countries. Lenin, however, proved that the imperialist world no longer formed one great chain and that the rupture would take place first in its weakest link.

As we all know events brilliantly confirmed this new theoretical conclusion.

Later the French Communist Party contributed to the development of Marxism-Leninism. In 1946, as we have already stated, it raised the question of the different ways of transition to socialism and came to the conclusion that a peaceful, democratic transition was possible in our country.

In 1950, taking into account the changed alignment of forces in the world, the growing strength of the socialist and democratic forces and the deteriorating position of imperialism, our Party propounded the thesis that a world war was no longer fatally inevitable, that the forces of peace now had the possibility of preventing the imperialists from starting a world war. This was a modification of the proposition stating that capitalism spells war in the same way as a thunder cloud spells storm, and that war can be eradicated only by establishing a new regime. On the contrary, we said, even if it continues to exist in a part of the world capitalism is no longer in a position to dictate its will to the peoples. If they unite and take action they can stay the hand of the warmongers.

It is not necessary to prove that French Marxists have contributed fruitfully to the theory of relations and links between democracy and socialism. Everybody also knows their contribution towards the study of such a pressing problem as the relations between Communists and Christians.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, pp. 211-12.

There is no denying that the changes which have taken place in the Church during the past few years have opened up new possibilities for the promotion of joint action by believers and non-believers and for a dialogue in the real sense of the word, for exchanges of views such as, for example, are taking place at mixed colloquia.

It will be recalled that the encyclical *Pacem in terris* by Pope John XXIII called not only for the possibility but also for the need for an alliance of all people of good will, believers and non-believers, in order to preserve peace.

The social and scientific progress achieved in our epoch has unquestionably compelled the Church to seek renewal.

Hundreds of millions of people throughout the world took part in the struggle against capitalist exploitation and for the establishment of socialism without the support of the Church and, frequently, in spite of it. This has made many Christians think. More and more believers are refusing to reconcile themselves to injustice and oppression.

The fraternal stand adopted by the Communists towards working people and democrats professing Christianity, their understanding and their open minds helped to speed up and facilitate the transition of religious workers, peasants and intellectuals to positions of struggle for progress, freedom, peace and socialism. In itself, not in the sense of affiliation to the Church, but in its subjective movement, the Catholic faith can acquire an anti-capitalist content.

The joint struggle of believers and non-believers for a better life, with each respecting the convictions of the other, does not imply the conversion of philosophies, but it is nonetheless possible and necessary because it can help to achieve the aspirations of the two groups. The resolution passed by the Central Committee of the French Communist Party at a session in Argenteuil states that "inasmuch as believing and non-believing working people have the same class interests and the same aspiration for socialism, inasmuch as believing and non-believing democrats similarly aspire for freedom, and inasmuch as peace fighters, believers and non-believers, seek to preserve life with similar passion they can and must unite".*

* "Débats sur les problèmes idéologiques et culturels", Comité Central du Parti communiste français, Argenteuil, March 11-13, 1966, *Cahiers du communisme*, No. 5-6, 1966, p. 276.

This is the basis on which our Communist Party, true to its "extended hand" policy, continues and will continue to promote efforts aimed at achieving mutual understanding and united action for peace, democracy and socialism.

Moreover, our Party makes every effort to combine theory with practice and analyse specific facts without bias. Abstract ideas have never been our point of departure. With reality as our guide we try to draw all Party members not only into the implementation but also the collective charting of our policy. We believe that this method is not only an earnest of success but also a feature of the Party, which lays claim to stirring the people to historical liberative action.

Marxism-Leninism is by no means affected by sclerosis, as our adversaries would have people believe. They give out what they desire for reality. On the contrary, it deals with the future, its eye on rejuvenation and modern problems. It seeks to activate the forces that are joining the common struggle and make the political actions of the working class more effective and fruitful.

* * *

Had it been necessary to give a brief characteristic of the French Communist Party, we would have summed it up in the words that it is a democratic mass Party serving the people and socialism.

It is a mass Party because countless threads link it with millions of working people, because its members are working people, men and women, with common cares, needs and hopes. The Communists, as all Frenchmen, live a family life and have professional and personal joys and sorrows. They are made of the same stuff as the entire mass of Frenchmen. The link between the people and its vanguard is direct and permanent.

By its very nature the Party cannot be a closed organisation, a "thing in itself". In the last analysis, its actions are never an expression of narrow Party interests.

It exists not only to serve the people. It has not been introduced into France's political life from without: its emergence was a historical necessity and its activity is necessary.

The entire experience of social life vividly demonstrates that the classes and the masses do not begin their struggle

spontaneously, without the leadership of a party. The Communist Party is the driving force of the working class and the world of labour in the struggle for socialism because it has a clear understanding of the conditions, course and general aims of the movement.

As the 1848 *Manifesto of the Communist Party* stated, the Communists have no interests that do not coincide with the interests of the entire mass of proletarians. They do not put forward special, sectarian principles. They work in alliance and concord with the democratic parties of all countries.

Their maxim is to serve the people, of whom they are an inseparable part.

To serve the people is the constant concern of the Communists, whom the trust of the people places at the head of municipal councils of innumerable large and small towns; even their adversaries acknowledge their devotion, dedication and competence.

To serve the people is the striving of all Communists who hold responsible posts in elective public organisations.

To serve the people is the cardinal concern of the Communists when they wage a day-to-day struggle at the head of the masses to replace the capitalist regime with the new, socialist society free of exploitation and presupposing the active participation of workers by hand and by brain in the direction and administration of social affairs.

* * *

The Communists are ordinary people and the destiny of ordinary people is dear to them.

They are ordinary and they are reasonable. They do not invent a world, but only perceive reality in its movement. They do not substitute their initiative, ideals and plans of organising society for the struggle of the classes and masses.

They act in accordance with existing facts: the struggle of the two large antagonistic classes, the revolutionary activity of the proletariat, the cohesion of all anti-monopolist strata in a united camp round the working class or shoulder to shoulder with it, the achievements of socialism throughout the world, and the general direction of present-day historical development. This was the approach to facts and outlook insisted on by Lenin, who wrote: "Marx's method consists, first of all, in taking due account of the *objective* content of

a historical process at a given moment, in definite and concrete conditions; this in order to realise, in the first place, the movement of *which* class is the mainspring of the progress possible in those concrete conditions.”*

To take the objective content of modern history into account means to see that in our day everything points to socialism. It has matured in the depths of the old society. State-monopoly capitalism creates the material prerequisites of a mighty socialist industry. The working class is determined to build a society delivered from long-standing injustice.

Together with its allies it is fighting to heal chronic ulcers, put an end to economic chaos, social poverty and lack of culture, and ensure abundance and man's dignity and grandeur. The greatest-hearted, most enlightened and most conscious people are joining the ranks of the revolutionaries.

Remote continents have also been set in motion. The peoples inhabiting them no longer wish to live a life of oppression. Naturally, in the struggle there have been and will be high and low tides. But in the movement of the contingents of the great army, which advances and retreats in various sectors, the main orientation and the general direction are not subject to doubt. The old world of profit, exploitation and war is cracking, disintegrating and collapsing, and we are participating in the birth of a new world.

Awareness of this lofty destiny does not free us from direct political action with the purpose of organising the movement of the masses in accordance with present-day problems. On the contrary, no progress towards socialism can be achieved save by a struggle to establish in France an advanced democracy with a new content.

It is only the unity of the working class and of all democrats that will make it possible to remove personal power, secure a great democratic change, the demand for which resounds ever more loudly, and establish the new, higher democracy which opens the road to socialism.

Encouraged by what has been achieved and measuring the road remaining to be covered, we shall fight with all our strength in order to consummate the unity of all the nation's main forces.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 143.

LENINISM AND THE BUILDING OF THE DEVELOPED SOCIALIST SOCIAL SYSTEM

**REALISATION OF LENINIST IDEALS
IN THE GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC**

*By WALTER ULBRICHT,
First Secretary, Central Committee,
Socialist Unity Party of Germany*

In the German Democratic Republic ever since the working class and its revolutionary Party have won political power and taken over the administration of social affairs, all the achievements linked with the setting up of the anti-fascist, democratic system and the building of socialism spring from the creative application of the scientific theory of Marxism-Leninism. Leninism's vitality and invincibility have been irrefutably confirmed in the homeland of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany and all the working people of the German Democratic Republic may be proud that they have helped to enrich and implement Marxism-Leninism. The working people of the German Democratic Republic mark the centenary of the birth of V. I. Lenin with the confidence that the Leninist teaching shows the way to resolve the great tasks of building the new, socialist Germany under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Party and in fraternal unity with the Soviet Union and other socialist countries.

LENINIST THEORY OF REVOLUTION APPLIED IN THE GDR

For us the Leninist theory of imperialism was the guide to action when, after the Second World War, in Germany, liberated from fascism largely through the efforts of the

glorious Soviet Army, we had to smash the forces of monopoly capitalism and nazism, dismantle the state apparatus and take the road of democratic and socialist reforms.

In 1945 Germany still lacked the prerequisites for the direct accomplishment of a socialist revolution. The tasks on the agenda were to complete the bourgeois-democratic revolution, consistently uproot nazism and establish an anti-fascist, democratic system. We acted on the basis of the conclusions drawn by Lenin, particularly in his *Two Tactics of Social-Democracy in the Democratic Revolution*. Also exceedingly important to us was Lenin's precept that *in broad alliance with all the democratic forces* in the struggle for democratic demands the *working class* must prepare the working people for the struggle for socialism. In line with Lenin's teaching we translated into practice the *proletariat's leading role* in the struggle for anti-fascist, democratic reforms. *Working-class unity*, achieved through the integration of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties and the formation of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, was the decisive prerequisite for an alliance of all the democratic forces, including anti-fascist bourgeois circles, an alliance which received its further development with the uprooting of nazism, the expropriation of the monopolists and big landowners, and democratic construction. The main tasks of the anti-fascist, democratic revolution were carried out with the formation of the German Democratic Republic; the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of workers and peasants acquired the precise shape of state power. In this way were the prerequisites formed for accomplishing the transition from the anti-fascist, democratic to the socialist revolution in accordance with Lenin's teaching. The road of this transition was shown to the people by the first five-year plan. At its 2nd Conference in 1952 the Socialist Unity Party of Germany was in a position to set the task of building the foundations of socialism in the German Democratic Republic.

In the GDR it was possible to accomplish the revolution in a peaceful, democratic way, thanks to the unity of the working class and its policy of alliances. However, there was a bitter class struggle. Invaluable assistance to the working class and its allies in carrying out these tasks was rendered by the Soviet Union, the homeland of Lenin,

which had made the decisive contribution towards the liberation of the German people from hitlerite fascism. The presence of the Soviet Union prevented military intervention by imperialism and ensured the country's peaceful and democratic development.

CREATIVE APPLICATION OF LENIN'S TEACHING ON THE BUILDING OF A SOCIALIST SOCIETY

In the German Democratic Republic socialist construction could not simply be a copy of the Soviet way. The task before the Socialist Unity Party of Germany was to apply Marxist-Leninist principles in accordance with the historical situation and the specific conditions in the GDR. This posed the Party with many new problems. For the first time a socialist society had to be built in a country with a high level of industrial development, where the working class comprised the majority of the population, where the nazi dictatorship and the war unleashed by it had filled the minds of a considerable part of the population with hideous ideological confusion and, lastly, in a country that had been split by imperialism. The resultant disproportion in the economy gave rise to extremely complicated problems. The transition to the socialist revolution thus took place under the difficult conditions of a division engineered by US imperialism to save the capitalist monopolies in West Germany. West Germany and West Berlin were ruled by the imperialist occupation powers in conjunction with rejuvenated German imperialism. The open frontier between the two German states facilitated Western sabotage and subversion and prevented the economic laws of socialism from operating effectively.

Lenin's teaching of socialist construction, of the establishment of socialist state power and the development of the socialist economy and culture provided a firm foundation for the fulfilment of the tasks of the socialist revolution in the German Democratic Republic. The Socialist Unity Party of Germany has always been guided by the Leninist thesis that in the process of the revolutionary struggle scientific socialism is developed and enriched with new practical experience and theoretical knowledge.

Successful socialist construction in the German Democratic Republic bears out *Lenin's conclusion that in the epoch of imperialism the transition to the building of socialism is an historical necessity* and that state-monopoly capitalism is the threshold of socialism.* The working people of the German Democratic Republic have built socialism in a country that was a stronghold of state-monopoly capitalism in Europe. In direct confrontation with the state-monopoly capitalism revived in West Germany, the working people of the GDR constantly refute the allegations of imperialist propaganda that socialism is only suitable for underdeveloped countries. In the imperialist camp they can no longer deny the colossal scientific, economic and technological achievements of the Soviet Union. The tremendous headway made by the people of the German Democratic Republic in all spheres of political, economic and cultural life is likewise further testimony of socialism's superiority over capitalism.

BUILDING THE FOUNDATIONS OF SOCIALISM

The specific conditions obtaining in the German Democratic Republic made it possible to accomplish the transition to the socialist revolution in a peaceful, democratic way. This had nothing in common with the theory of "peaceful growth into socialism" expounded by the agents of reformism. Underlying the policy of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany is Lenin's tenet that "the question of power is the fundamental question of every revolution"*** and that the socialist revolution can only be accomplished by establishing and consolidating the power of the working class. In the course of the class struggle against the attempts of the imperialist countries to restore capitalism and the resistance of the reactionary classes within the country, in the process of the revolutionary change we succeeded in furthering *united action by all democratic forces under the leadership of the working class* and consolidating socialist state power as the all-embracing organisation of the working class' alliance with all segments of the people. The Socialist

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 359.

*** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 346.

Unity Party of Germany developed and came forward as a Party of the Leninist type. It resolutely exposed all manifestations of revisionism, which had sunk deep roots in Germany, and Left-radical trends. By critically analysing the level of development that had been reached, the Party was able to plan the next stages of revolutionary change, opportunely resolve pressing problems and rally the people for the implementation of these tasks.

Two stages of development may be singled out in the history of the socialist revolution in the German Democratic Republic from the emergence of elements of socialism under the anti-fascist, democratic system to the present. The *first stage* witnessed the building of the foundations of socialism. In this period of development the means of production in industry gradually passed to public ownership, while the peasants voluntarily united in agricultural producers' co-operatives. Socialist ownership of the means of production was the foundation on which the socialist planned economy was organised, the basis was laid for socialist upbringing and education and considerable headway was achieved in the promotion of socialist national culture.

The first stage of the socialist revolution in the GDR ended with the establishment of socialist relations of production and the creation of the conditions for the operation of the economic laws of socialism. We have now entered the *second stage of development*, in the course of which, with the completion of socialist construction as our goal, we have to make full use of the economic laws operating under socialism and build the social system of socialism as a whole.

SECOND STAGE OF THE SOCIALIST REVOLUTION IN THE GDR

We characterise this period as the *formation of the developed social system of socialism*. This period was ushered in by the decisions of the 6th Congress of the SUPG in 1963 on the Party Programme, which charted the *way to triumph of socialism* and the creation of the prerequisites for the transition to communism in the German Democratic Republic. To pave the way to these objectives, our Party's 7th Congress, held in 1967, used a scientific forecast of the

level of scientific and technological development in 1980 to prognosticate social progress and define the cardinal tasks in building a developed social system of socialism. The SUPG's forecast of social development takes the *link between the socialist and the scientific and technological revolution* into account.

As was noted at the Party's 7th Congress, the development of the socialist social system is characterised by "a high level and rapid growth rates of social productive forces, by stable, expanding socialist relations of production, firm socialist state power, the all-sided development of socialist democracy, a high level of education and an improvement of working and living conditions. It is characterised by the penetration of socialist ideology and culture into all spheres of social life".*

The developed social system of socialism is thus an objectively existing dialectical unity and inter-dependence of all the elements of social process. In charting these strategic aims, our point of departure was Lenin's characteristic of socialism as an "entire *historical period* which separates capitalism from 'classless society', from communism",** the conclusion that socialism is not a short transitional phase in the development of society but a *relatively independent socio-economic formation in the historical epoch of transition from capitalism to communism* on a world scale.

SOCIALIST STATE POWER IN THE GDR— A FORM OF THE DICTATORSHIP OF THE PROLETARIAT

The forecast made by the Party's 7th Congress and the clarity of the aims and tasks in completing the building of socialism made it possible to draw up the Constitution of the German Democratic Republic. This Constitution, adopted on April 6, 1968 after nation-wide discussion and voting, recorded the achievements in socialist construction and laid the state-legal foundation for building a developed socialist society in the German Democratic Republic.

* 7th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany, Berlin, April 17-22, 1967, Russ. ed., Politizdat, Moscow, 1968, p. 360.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 413.

Article 1 of the Constitution characterises the GDR as a political organisation of the working people in town and countryside, who are building socialism under the leadership of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party.* Underlying this definition and the Constitution as a whole is Lenin's concept of the essence and tasks of the state in the period of socialist reorganisation. This gives expression to the fact that in the GDR state power is a form of the dictatorship of the proletariat corresponding to the general laws of social development and the specific conditions under which these laws operate in our country. In *The State and Revolution* Lenin stressed: "The transition from capitalism to communism is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat*."** The socialist state of the German Democratic Republic is one of the variety of political forms with intrinsic indications of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the most salient of which are the leading role of the proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist Party, the consolidation of the proletariat's alliance with the other working classes and strata, the promotion of the creative organising role of the socialist state and the broad development of socialist democracy for the working people.

GROWING LEADING ROLE OF THE WORKING CLASS AND ITS MARXIST-LENINIST PARTY

The establishment of socialist relations of production and the complete eradication of exploitation of man by man put an end to class antagonisms within the country. However, various classes and strata have remained. The elimination of class antagonisms does not in any way belittle the leading role of the working class and its Party or of the socialist state. An objective demand and vital prerequisite for the building of a developed socialist social system is that the leading role of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party should be steadily enhanced.

* *Die Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, Staatsverlag, Zeit im Bild, Berlin, 1968, p. 9.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 413.

The proletariat continues to be history's most progressive class and the most revolutionary force. It is the creative force of modern socialist large-scale production, which objectively determines progress and the rate of social development. Moreover, the proletariat grows uninterruptedly. Its share of work by brain in direct production and in the leadership of the state and society is rapidly increasing. *Both physically and intellectually the proletariat is thus coming forward as a ruling class which functions more and more efficiently.*

Thanks to the Marxist-Leninist Party the working class is able to carry out its historic mission of building a developed socialist social system. The Party of the working class personifies the unity between revolutionary theory and the revolutionary movement. Guided by Marxist-Leninist theory it is the only Party that can forecast the further development of socialist society as a whole and on that foundation chart the main tasks in the conquest of the future. Its policy consists of applying and further developing Marxism-Leninism on the broadest possible collective basis, in close unity with the life of society and with the utilisation of the vast experience accumulated by the working people. The main content of its work is determined by its activity in ideology. The Party of the proletariat gives all classes and social strata clear prospects and aims of building socialism. *Its main objective is to foster the socialist consciousness of the proletariat and all other working people.*

THE LENINIST POLICY OF ALLIANCES

The growing leading role of the working class and its Party embraces the further development and consolidation of the proletariat's alliance with the co-operated peasants, the intelligentsia and other strata. This alliance, as is stated in the Constitution, is the lasting foundation of the socialist social system of the German Democratic Republic. In conformity with the Leninist policy of alliances, the development of socialist state power in the GDR has from the very beginning followed the line of drawing all the working classes and strata into the administration of the state and the economy. In order to complete the building of socialism it is necessary to achieve closer co-operation between all

classes and strata. In the process of social activity directed towards the attainment of common aims all the political and social forces of the people rally closer round the leading forces—the working class and its Party. The objective laws of social, scientific and technological development lead to the union of classes and strata on the social level, i.e., the union of other classes and strata with the working class, which continues its independent development.

Slogans helping to pursue the policy of alliances have been formulated in accordance with the specifics of our country. Co-operation between the Party of the working class and other democratic parties—Christian-Democratic Union of Germany, Liberal-Democratic Party of Germany, National-Democratic Party of Germany and the Democratic Peasant Party of Germany—has thus become a form of this alliance. This co-operation took shape at the time of the anti-fascist, democratic reforms and continued to develop and grow strong during the transition to the building of socialism. In the course of building a developed socialist society this tested co-operation will be further consolidated under the Party's leadership and the responsibility of all the parties and mass organisations of the democratic bloc will be enhanced.

Specific forms of the policy of alliances also developed with regard to the owners of small and medium industrial enterprises who had not been expropriated by the socialist revolution. These enterprises were able to expand under the economic development plan. However, the productivity of many of them was much lower than that of the enterprises operated by the state. For that reason they willingly concluded co-operative agreements with state-run enterprises and combines in order to secure participation in research and in the development of new technological processes. A considerable number of these enterprises utilised state participation. The owners of all private enterprises were drawn into constructive co-operation within the framework of the socialist planned economy through co-operative links with socialist enterprises, co-operative unions, co-operation in branch groups and, last but not least, through patient explanatory work. Most of the artisan enterprises have united in artisan producers' co-operatives.

"The alliance of all the forces of the people finds its organised expression in the National Front of Democratic

Germany" (Art. 3 of the Constitution).^{*} This National Front came into being as a broad patriotic movement in the struggle against the country's division by the imperialists, for a peaceful and democratic future of the nation. In the course of socialist construction the National Front turned from an anti-fascist, democratic movement into a broad socialist popular movement. Reaching far beyond the parties and mass organisations of the democratic bloc, *the National Front of Democratic Germany personifies the broadest mass alliance of all the social forces of the people in Germany's history.*

GROWING ROLE OF THE SOCIALIST STATE

In accordance with Leninist principles, in order to build a developed socialist social system the creative, organising function of the socialist state has to be further improved. At the same time, the scientific and technological revolution, whose achievements must be used to promote socialist transformations, is also instrumental in enhancing the role played by the socialist state. The principal tasks confronting the socialist state include the direction of the planned development of the productive forces, particularly the planned development of science and the efficient utilisation of its achievements, the fostering of socialist upbringing and education and the systematic improvement of the people's living standard and cultural level. *The work of the socialist state is directed towards the promotion of the people's creative abilities and their joint action in order to advance the welfare of society as a whole and of every person individually.* The socialist state makes sure that every citizen abides by the rules of the socialist way of life. As the organ of power of the dictatorship of the proletariat, the state ensures the reliable defence of the German Democratic Republic and of the people's socialist achievements. In general outline the Constitution defines the purposes of the state organs of power in the German Democratic Republic. All power serves the welfare of the people, states Article 4 of the Constitution. It safeguards the people's peaceful life,

^{*} *Die Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, p. 10.

protects socialist society, guarantees the planned growth of living standards and the free development of every individual, protects his dignity and guarantees the rights recorded in the Constitution.*

A feature of the further development of the socialist state is the unity between scientific state leadership and the promotion of socialist democracy. The scientific level of the state's leadership must be raised in order to ensure the efficient functioning of the social system as a whole and of its individual elements. State leadership demands scientific prevision and dynamic reaction to the growing new requirements of the scientific and technological revolution and social development. The tasks of state leadership must be carried out from the standpoint of the social development of the entire system. This means the comprehensive promotion of various aspects of social development—political, economic, scientific, technological, social, ideological and so on in their interrelationship and interdependence.

PROMOTION OF SOCIALIST DEMOCRACY

Under scientific state leadership the promotion of socialist democracy is an objective need. The growing complexity and manifold character of the tasks require the creative, conscious participation of millions of people, their conscious action for the attainment of common aims. State leadership of the development and effective mobilisation of the people's creative strength and initiative for the attainment of a higher level of social advance and also activity in scientific management presuppose the utilisation of their experience, knowledge and wealth of ideas. Lenin's words that "a state is strong when the people are politically conscious. It is strong when the people know everything, can form an opinion of everything and do everything consciously",** fully apply to the socialist state at the modern stage.

The Constitution of the German Democratic Republic gives legislative embodiment to the principles underlying socialist democracy. One of the basic rights guaranteed by

* *Die Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, p. 11.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 256.

the Constitution is the "right to broad participation in the organisation of the political, economic, social and cultural life of socialist society and the socialist state".* The Constitution defines the place of the leading associations of citizens —enterprises, towns, communities, trade unions and socialist producers' co-operatives in which the people exercise their right to help direct social development. The fundamental principle of state development is "the sovereignty of the working people exercised on the basis of democratic centralism" (Article 47 of the Constitution).** The place occupied by the representative bodies of the people as organs of state power conforms to the principle under which all political power is exercised by the people. These bodies form the foundation of the entire system of state organs (Article 5). They are the "working bodies" whose establishment was required by Marx and Lenin and in which the representatives of the people "themselves have to work, have to execute their own laws, have themselves to test the results achieved in reality, and to account directly to their constituents".*** The Socialist Unity Party of Germany gives close attention to the representative bodies of the people in order to broaden their democratic foundation, raise the scientific level of the conferences conducted by them and, in line with the increasing requirements, make sure that the decisions adopted by them are strictly implemented.

ECONOMIC SYSTEM OF SOCIALISM

The economic system of socialism is the principal and most dynamic element of the entire social system. Its formation was a long and complex process. As early as 1954, i.e., two years after the decision on socialist construction was adopted, the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany insisted on a more *efficient application of the objective laws of socialism*. At the time this chiefly meant boosting the profitability of state-run enterprises, *complying with the law of value and securing the transition to cost*

* *Die Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, pp. 21-22.

** *Ibid.*, p. 37.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, pp. 423, 424.

accounting. Furthermore, it was stressed that the economic and operational independence of enterprises had to be restored in order to give scope to the initiative of the rank and file and managements. The measures taken to protect the state frontier in 1961 were of immense importance to the working-out of the economic system of socialism in the German Democratic Republic. These measures put an end to economic sabotage and other subversive actions by imperialism against socialist construction in the GDR. After we had ensured the protection of the state frontier, we were able to concentrate on *the theoretical elaboration of the economic system of socialism, and test and apply it in practice in order to allow the economic laws of socialism to operate with the utmost efficacy.*

In building up the economic system of socialism we were guided by Lenin's basic conclusions, which we enlarged on in conformity with our national and historical conditions. After the Great October Socialist Revolution Lenin repeatedly scrutinised the ways and means of promoting the creative initiative of the people with the purpose of furthering the building of socialism. For Lenin this was not only a pressing problem of those difficult years experienced by the then young Soviet Republic, but a fundamental question of the economic struggle between socialism and capitalism. *Lenin's conclusion that higher labour productivity would give the socialist social system decisive superiority over capitalism* also defines the basic idea underlying the economic system of socialism.

Essentially, the economic system of socialism, which is the Party-guided conscious application of the economic laws of socialism by the socialist state, by the socialist owners of the means of production, pursues the aim of attaining the highest possible level of labour productivity with the aid of efficient scientific organisation and by mastering the most up-to-date technologies. The dynamics of the economic system of socialism is that it facilitates the maximum increase of production, promotes the growth of the national income and, at the same time, the rapid development of other elements of the system, and furthers the uninterrupted consolidation of the socialist social system as a whole.

The economic system of socialism links the socialist revolution with the scientific and technological revolution. It allows making effective and rational use of all the driving

forces and advantages of the socialist system in order to employ the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in the interests of the people and consolidate the socialist state and, thereby, the entire community of socialist states. Specifically, this signifies the attainment of the pinnacle of science and technology. To this end it is necessary to conduct innovatory research and secure the swiftest and most effective application of the latest scientific achievements in serial industrial production. It goes without saying that this can only be achieved on the basis of the most up-to-date, highly productive scientific and economic organisation and comprehensive socialist automation.

The economic system of socialism serves, first and foremost, *the purposeful enforcement of the economic law of the development of socialism*. This basic law of the socialist system requires the constant improvement, extension and intensification of socialist production and reproduction on the highest scientific and technological level, the boosting of labour productivity and reduction of costs in order to strengthen the socialist system, better satisfy the material and cultural requirements of citizens and promote socialist social relations.

Co-operation with the Soviet Union is of immense importance to the economic system of socialism in the German Democratic Republic. Economic, scientific and technological co-operation with the largest and industrially most powerful socialist country links us with the Soviet potential and enables us to concentrate on spheres which determine the pattern of our economy and in which the most favourable prerequisites exist for achieving the world level of production and thereby making the maximum contribution towards strengthening the socialist community.

DEMOCRATIC CENTRALISM IN THE ECONOMIC SYSTEM

The scientific and technological revolution has substantially accelerated and broadened the process of the socialisation of labour. This process has affected scientific research and education and is mirrored in the development of economically and technologically powerful industrial combines. It has now penetrated such branches of the national economy

as agriculture, the food industry and trade. All the more important for us is Lenin's precept that socialist development largely depends on how the *working masses ensure unity of will and adapt their institutions to large-scale machine industry*. From this we have drawn the conclusion that democratic centralism must be the feature distinguishing the economic system of socialism. This means, first and foremost, the steady extension and improvement of the socialist state's economic function, and the promotion of the people's direct participation in planning and administration under the leadership of the Party of the working class. Further, this signifies the improvement of the socialist planned economy, and the development of the economic independence of large and small industrial enterprises, an independence linked with centralised state planning and implemented on the basis of the state plan with the utilisation of commodity-money relations in the system of cost accounting. In this manner the interests of the socialist state, all social interests and the creative activity of the people dovetail in the economic system of socialism.

This system leads the employees of socialist enterprises and other economic units to the conscious application of the economic laws of socialism. This takes place through the operation of the law of state-plan targets determined by the law of investment, prices, credits, wages and so on. Here we deal with a kind of information that helps society to run the various industrial enterprises and understand the requirements springing from the operation of economic laws. The responsibility devolving on the socialist enterprises for their economic activity and, in particular, for the independent distribution of means with the object of enlarging reproduction and satisfying the personal material requirements of the people allows them to adopt a creative approach to the tasks set by society. Here the scientifically founded work of managements must tie in with the democratic participation of the people in this work. In this lies the dialectics of the operation of the economic system of socialism, and the substance of this system, founded on democratic centralism. The economic system is, thus, not an automatically operating economic mechanism but a *system under which the people are consciously active in the name of socialism*.

SCIENTIFIC LEADERSHIP AND FORECASTING

Scientific leadership is an expression of the proletariat's function of guide in the formation of the economic system of socialism. Its purpose is opportunely to bring to light the requirements stemming from the development of the productive forces and the operation of the economic laws of socialism, to adopt the necessary decisions aimed at achieving the utmost strengthening of the socialist social system, concentrate manpower and means and utilise them rationally and in an organised manner. Scientific leadership makes it possible to exercise strict control over the fulfilment of adopted decisions and constantly analyse the process of development.

A prerequisite of scientific leadership generally is the working-out of strictly scientific forecasts for science and technology and the accompanying basic economic processes. Forecasts for individual branches of the national economy have been and will continue to be made in the German Democratic Republic on the basis of the over-all socialist development forecast made at the 7th Congress of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany. These forecasts give a clear idea of the increasingly rapid and profound development of the productive forces taking place under the impact of the scientific and technological revolution. As a consequence, forecasts are becoming the objective criterion and foundation for decisions in the sphere of scientific leadership. To allow forecasts to fulfil this function, they must be constantly augmented and perfected in accordance with the development of objective reality.

The speed with which the recommendations contained in forecasts are carried out and the economic efficacy of these recommendations largely depend on how the country's forces are concentrated. *Present-day socialist economic and scientific organisation creates the prerequisites for an effective concentration of forces.* Objectively indispensable unity of all phases of social reproduction, from scientific research to the marketing of production on the scale of society as a whole and of individual enterprises and combines, must be secured in order to achieve a high level of labour productivity through the swift application of the results of scientific research. This process develops chiefly through the building

of large socialist industrial combines allowing for the utilisation of all the achievements of the Marxist-Leninist science of organisation, economic cybernetics and production research with the aid of electronic computers.

Socialist industrial combines provide the foundation for state structural policy in accordance with *the long-term plan, which is the main instrument for the direction of the national economic and the whole of social development in the economic system of socialism*. The long-term plan includes tasks determined on the basis of scientific forecasts, their purpose being to give the national economy a structure allowing for the utmost increase of the national income. Moreover, the long-term plan also covers research, key investments, structure-defining commodities, and international co-operation between countries in the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance. Further, the long-term plan defines the long-term norms of enterprises, particularly the deduction of profits to the state and long-term price planning. On this basis the enterprises can plan reproduction and balance their expenditures on technological innovations, comprehensive automation and so forth. The manner in which these possibilities are exploited at individual enterprises depends also largely on scientific management and the active participation of the people in planning and management. Tested forms of democratic participation by the people in management and planning are: discussion of the enterprise's production plan, membership of production committee, standing production conferences, and team conferences.

**ECONOMIC SYSTEM OF SOCIALISM
EXCLUDES "MARKET ECONOMY"
AND "SELF-ADMINISTRATION"**

Essentially, the economic system of socialism is a socialist planned economy, a conscious and creative moulding of the social process of reproduction in accordance with the central state plan of economic and all-round social development. From this it follows that in the economic system of socialism there is a market but no place either for "market economy" or the "self-administration of enterprises".

Naturally, in the socialist economy the market does not determine social reproduction. This is determined by the

economic laws of socialism, which are mirrored in economic planning. The conscious utilisation of the economic laws operating in socialist society is facilitated not by the spontaneity of the market but by state planning founded on scientific forecasting. In the last analysis the slogan "self-administration of enterprises" means the demand of a market economy, which is absolutely alien to socialism because enterprises do not plan and utilise the process of reproduction in accordance with objective economic laws, and this process is made dependent on market anarchy.

Moreover, in the light of the scientific and technological revolution, the theory of "socialist market economy" and the "self-administration of enterprises" is tantamount to a renunciation of the socialist social and economic system's historic superiority over the capitalist system and to making socialism dependent on the industrially developed capitalist countries. Theories of this kind are fundamentally at variance with the existing vital unity of the social process of reproduction, and with its planned direction by the socialist state, and thereby deprive socialism of its major advantages and motive forces. Lastly, all these theories signify the abandonment of the historic task set by the working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party, namely, that of directing the social process of reproduction as a whole in the interests of the people and *tying in the creative activity and responsibility of socialist commodity producers with central state planning with the purpose of consciously shaping the economic system of socialism.*

ALL FOR THE BENEFIT OF MAN

The place occupied by the economic system in the social system of socialism is determined not only by the fact that all the material values needed for the uninterrupted and planned development of socialist society are created in the sphere of socialist production. Material production is a sphere which considerably influences the development and moulding of the commodity producer into a genuinely socialist personality. The classics of Marxism-Leninism had repeatedly underscored the *immense role played by labour in the formation of man's consciousness*. The dialectics of the economic system of socialism is that it brings the social-

ist commodity producers not only to the realisation of the requirements of economic laws but, equally, to an awareness of their own creative strength, of their role as conscious and active makers of life. This is what expresses *socialism's ultimate, decisive aim—the benefit of man*.

Of course, it is not only the economic system that determines the development of society and its members. All the elements of the system operate here in their interdependence and unity. Take the *integrated socialist system of education* set up in the German Democratic Republic in recent years. It is unquestionably influenced by the economic system of socialism inasmuch as its aim is to train socialist commodity producers who will in future carry out the tasks envisaged by the long-term economic plan. Moreover, it is considerably influenced by the *development of socialist national culture*, which more and more frequently deals with vital problems of man under conditions witnessing the formation of a developed socialist society. Thus, in its turn, socialist national culture influences the economic system directly and through the system of education. All the advantages of the socialist system, of the socialist social relations acquire effective force only when under the leadership of the Party of the working class the people actively participate in building the developed social system of socialism and its individual elements.

Thus, in the German Democratic Republic the socialist system reaffirms the ability, intrinsic only to socialism, of resolving the basic problems of our times with man and for the benefit of man. The Constitution of the GDR defines the purpose behind the building of a developed socialist society as follows: "*Man is in the centre of all the aspirations of socialist society and its state.*"* This implies not only the increasing satisfaction of man's material and cultural requirements, his social maintenance and the guarantee of all the rights of every citizen. It implies mainly the development of all citizens and the moulding of the socialist individual, the building of a truly human community of people—socialism.

The people uprooted capitalist exploitation and took over the leadership of the state and the national economy. The prerequisites for the development of every individual, i.e.,

* *Die Verfassung der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik*, p. 9.

for the unfolding of each individual's creative ability and moral qualities, have taken shape in and for society. Human relations founded on socialist morals, comradeship and mutual assistance are growing stronger. *To a growing extent the thoughts and actions of citizens are determined by their sense of responsibility for the common cause*, by their desire to do their utmost for society.

However, the socialist consciousness and the new socialist human relations do not develop by themselves. *This process must be systematically organised and directed by plan by the Marxist-Leninist Party and the socialist state.* To this goal are subordinated all ideological work, the socialist system of education and upbringing, the mass media and the further development of socialist social labour acquiring various organisational forms of socialist democracy. Growing importance is acquired by the work of socialist collectives, whose power of creatively moulding the individual manifests itself most fully where the collective spirit is achieved consciously, where the reigning atmosphere is one of creative exchange of views and free discussion, and where every effort is made to resolve the tasks and problems of the collective and of every person individually. True humanism and socialism's superiority over capitalism, which is founded on the exploitation and suppression of man, are most pronounced in the moulding of the new, socialist man and his socialist social relations.

SOCIALIST-NATIONAL CULTURE

The formation of a culture intrinsic to socialism, the shaping of a socialist cultural way of life, *the promotion of literature and art that make a constructive contribution to the building of socialism* are of immense importance for the development of the social system of socialism, for the destiny of the entire German nation, and for lasting peace in Europe. We hold that the moulding of the man of socialist society is the cardinal task of our culture.

After liberation from fascism, the socialist and anti-fascist, democratic forces, led by the Party of the working class, accomplished a far-reaching ideological transformation and laid the foundation for the renewal of humanist German culture. In working on the creation of a new

German cultural life the Party drew, at the time, on the finest humanist traditions of German classical and world culture, on the traditions of German anti-fascist, democratic culture: substantial influence was exercised by the Soviet Union's cultural achievements. After carrying out a reform in education, we began building up new conditions for the education and development of young people. From the very outset our Party concentrated on two aspects of the process of closing the gap between the people and art: *the new content of art and the utilisation of all the possibilities of education for all the people.*

Anti-fascist literature as represented by Johannes R. Becher, Bertolt Brecht, Willi Bredel, Hans Marchwitza, Ludwig Renn, Anna Seghers, Friedrich Wolf and others began to turn from a revolutionary proletarian literary movement into a centre of socialist national literature as early as in the bitter years of exile. With this centre was closely linked the work of such outstanding writers as Thomas Mann, Lion Feuchtwanger, Heinrich Mann and Arnold Zweig. After 1945 the concept underlying cultural development, as worked out by the Party during those years jointly with workers in culture, proved to be a suitable foundation for a cultural policy in alliance with all forces prepared to participate in building the new society. In 1945-49 the main task of literature was to educate people in an anti-fascist, democratic spirit. Outstanding books were written about the anti-fascist Resistance, and about the heroic struggle of Communist, Social-Democratic and non-Party workers and intellectuals against nazi barbarity.

Life forged ahead. A two-year plan was drawn up. The German Democratic Republic came into being. The first five-year plan was fulfilled. New and steadily more important tasks were set the working people. The rate of scientific and technological progress was accelerated to such an extent that the workers and intellectuals had to exert a great effort to keep abreast of the new phenomena and new technologies. This period witnessed the appearance of socialist labour teams, whose motto was to work, study and live in a socialist manner. Workers and engineers strove not only to raise labour productivity but also consolidate the new way of life. They were eager to help create the new, socialist culture. This inspired many artists and writers. They drew closer to the people, taking part in the life and work of the

socialist teams. In this atmosphere the Central German Publishing House sponsored the first joint conference of writers, artists and members of socialist teams at the House of Culture of the Chemical Works in Bitterfeld. The 1959 Bitterfeld Conference initiated the creation of a socialist national culture. Five years later it was further developed at the second conference in Bitterfeld.

The first Bitterfeld Conference helped writers and artists to establish close contact with social practice, stimulated amateur art by the people, furthered the mastering and continuation of the great humanist traditions of German and world culture and helped to promote new variety art and surmount the gap between art and amusement.

Much has been accomplished of what was charted by the Bitterfeld Conference. New tasks appeared and the former tasks became more specific. In our republic the literature and art of socialist realism have become an expression and component of the political power of the people.

A new, socialist generation appeared in all fields of art. Writers and artists acquired stature through their participation in the building of socialism. They displayed an increasing interest in the problems of the people and strove to bring their own lives into conformity with socialist principles. They responded to the Bitterfeld Conference's call to writers: "Change your own life. This is of decisive significance for the development of the new literature."

What were the changes in the life of writers? First and foremost, the establishment of close contact and co-operation with the people, and assimilation of the Marxist-Leninist world outlook. This was of tremendous importance, because today, more than ever before, true art requires a broad outlook and an awareness of the prospects of development. The Bitterfeld way was to facilitate the spiritual moulding of the man of socialist society and the promotion of a national culture. In the Programme of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany it is stated that the socialist national culture is truly humanistic and of the people, that it is the legitimate continuation of all that was great, humanist and progressive in the culture of our people in the past, and that it unites all this with the cultural traditions of the German proletariat's more than century-long revolutionary struggle. Socialist German national culture is becoming part of the culture of the world socialist system. Works of art help to

re-educate man morally in the spirit of socialism. They give him the inspiration to perform great feats in the name of socialism, awaken in him a love for labour, enrich the cultural life of the people, mould the mental and spiritual abilities of the man of socialist society and teach him the joy of living.

In the process of building a developed social system of socialism the links between society, art and culture have also to be promoted. The emergence of a totally new system of links is an historical law on the road to the new stage of our society's development. Our Party is fully aware of the great responsibility that it objectively bears for these aspects of life as well. It by no means considers the planning and guidance of cultural development as interference "from without", as being "alien to art". It holds that they are necessary as a means of releasing all cultural forces, all the motive forces of cultural progress. The deepening and extension of the Party's leading role and the cultural and educational work of the state are a major prerequisite for creating an improved system of links between art and society adequate to the whole of our social development. In order that these important tasks may be fulfilled the broadest circles, chiefly the creative unions—true organs of democratic self-education in which new problems are discussed and ascertained jointly in a comradely atmosphere—must actively help to promote cultural development. Problems of ideology must not be separated from those of aesthetics and style and they must be discussed not abstractly but on the example of a concrete work. It is extremely important to draw all the people engaged in art and all creative workers into all phases of planning and directing cultural development. This principle was successfully applied by our first Minister of Culture Johannes R. Becher, and in many ways on its further development depends the success of our policy in the cultural sphere.

The Socialist Unity Party of Germany has done much on the theoretical and practical levels to draw the whole of socialist art and culture into the general development of the socialist social system. Our guideline was the thesis that major tasks in culture cannot be carried out exclusively by specialists. The active influence of broad sections of the people on these new processes is indispensable whether it is a question of an open discussion of a work of art or a discussion with

creative workers at an early stage of the creative process on problems of our life, on the architecture of our towns, production aesthetics or other matters relating to the socialist way of life. The new tasks in the cultural field can only be accomplished where they are understood as tasks of the people's culture of socialist society. This also applies to art itself. Our Party facilitates the development of all forms of art in accordance with their specifics. The standpoint expressed in the thesis of "art for art's sake" has nothing in common with our conception of a socialist national culture. At the same time, however, a fact that must be stressed is that developed socialist society needs art as such. A work of art conveys a message only when it is executed masterfully, with consummate skill. The demand for compelling influence on the masses and a really high level of artistic skill in the shaping of the socialist world outlook and the individual is more justified today than ever before. The importance of the question of close contact between art and the people and of the efficacy of socialist culture's influence on the masses is growing not only with regard to readers and viewers in the socialist countries but also in connection with the influence exercised by socialist culture in the worldwide ideological struggle.

The unfolding of the new, fraternal relations between people of different classes and strata, in workers' collectives, in human association, and the creation of vivid images of the socialist way of thinking, mirroring the new unity of thought, feeling and action, and of the ideal and the real are of immense importance for the whole aesthetic essence of art and for attaining unity between the beautiful, the existing and the good. In the German Democratic Republic art scored its first successes along this road. This is noted primarily in TV dramaturgy. The Party highly appraises precisely these achievements, being guided by Lenin's statement to Lunacharsky on the importance of cinematography. Acting in the spirit of Lenin's precepts, the Party draws the attention of creative workers, critics and theoreticians to a major art genre like TV dramaturgy in order to raise this field of art, which is vital to our entire culture, to the level of our aesthetic tasks. Some of our creative workers in television have achieved good results precisely because they dealt imaginatively with the new, fundamental problems of our life without letting attention

be distracted by trifles and insignificant matters. Literature, painting, sculpture, music, the cinema, the theatre and other arts, particularly folk art, have marked the 20th anniversary of our workers' and peasants' state with new, major works. For our part, we are bending every effort to facilitate the development of world socialist culture, which unites socialist national cultures on a high level and proves its superiority over all bourgeois cultures.

OUR NATIONAL MISSION

The building of a developed social system of socialism in the GDR is of immense national importance. After the Second World War, when in collusion with the German monopolists and separatists the US imperialists separated the Western occupation zones from our Fatherland in order to restore monopoly capitalist rule in these zones, the West German separatist state became a military flashpoint in the heart of Europe. Unbridled armaments race and an aspiration to gain possession of nuclear weapons, revise frontiers and generally revise the results of the Second World War characterise the policy pursued by the revanchist, militarist and neo-nazi forces predominant in the Bonn state. West German imperialism's aggressive nature, expressed in the "policy of single representation" and expansionist ambitions to achieve hegemony in the political, economic and military spheres threaten the peace and security of our continent. In face of this threat the national mission of the German Democratic Republic is to expose the expansionist ambitions and new methods of the West German imperialists and militarists by launching a nation-wide struggle and foiling their designs.

The objective is thus to compel the West German Federal Republic to coexist peacefully with the socialist German state and unmask the plans of the revanchists. The stronger the German Democratic Republic becomes in all spheres and the higher the level of its socialist social system the more successfully will it cope, side by side with all peace-loving nations, with this historic task. In close alliance with the USSR and other Warsaw Treaty countries, the GDR has consistently and resolutely repulsed all the encroachments by West German imperialism. Nothing came of all

the attempts of the Bonn Government and the leadership of the Social-Democratic Party serving it to hold up socialist development in the German Democratic Republic by ideological subversion. The further planned development of the socialist social system in the GDR widely diffuses the influence of this democratic and humanist example of building the new society.

The Leninist teaching of the national question is of particular importance to the German working class and its Marxist-Leninist Party. We have always acted on the principle that the essence of the national question is determined by the social factor, in other words, that in Germany the national question can be resolved only by deposing those who bear the responsibility for starting two world wars and splitting Germany and who by modified methods are pursuing the same political aims as Hitler tried to attain. The overthrow of the state-monopoly rule of the most reactionary circles of the West German military-industrial complex and finance capital is first and foremost the task of the struggle being waged by the West German working class and its allies. However, the working people of the socialist German state can contribute decisively to this struggle by making the progressive, democratic forces in West Germany aware of the example of a future united socialist Germany. The more convincingly the working people of the German Democratic Republic demonstrate the superiority of the socialist social system at the final stages of socialist construction, the better will the working people of the Federal Republic of Germany understand that their prospects and the future of the entire nation are linked exclusively with socialism.

IN THIS WAY WE REVERE LENIN

Marking the centenary of the birth of V. I. Lenin, the German Democratic Republic enters the third decade of its existence. The struggle to build and develop the first socialist state on German soil is not an easy one. The working people have expended a great effort. Complex problems had to be resolved under difficult conditions. But we had as our guide the world-historic model created by the Great October Socialist Revolution under Lenin's leadership. We

learned on the basis of the vast theoretical heritage left to the international working class by the greatest scientist of our age. We heed the counsel given by Lenin to the German working-class movement. And we can always rely on the fraternal assistance of the Soviet people and of the Soviet state that was founded by Lenin.

Led by the Socialist Unity Party of Germany the working people of the German Democratic Republic cherish the memory of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin. Translating his behests into reality and relying on unbreakable friendship with the Soviet Union they are confidently and resolutely working to complete the building of socialist society.

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST IMPERIALISM— THE COMMON TASK OF THE COMMUNISTS AND ALL REVOLUTIONARY FORCES

By GUS HALL,
General Secretary,
Communist Party
of the United States of America

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties is a significant landmark in the history of the Marxist-Leninist Parties. It continued and developed, under the new conditions, the Leninist principles of the struggle for the unity of the world revolutionary proletarian and national liberation movement and for the consolidation of the anti-imperialist front.

The documents approved at the Moscow Meeting have tremendous historic importance. The most important among them is the Charter of all the revolutionary forces, named *Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces*, which is aimed at raising the revolutionary-liberation movement to a new, higher level.

It is impossible to mobilise against imperialism if you provide no analysis of what you are fighting and no basis for the policy and tactics of struggle against imperialism. Each Party charts its own strategy and tactics, but can it chart them without relating the particular to the general, the national to the international situation? A correct and balanced assessment of the moment is at all times a necessary foundation for an examination of past policies—and for the projection of new policies, strategic or tactical.

The transition from capitalism to socialism is a many-sided process. It is political; it is ideological; it is military;

and it is economic. There are moments of explosion. There are periods of evolutionary development. There are violent transfers of class power and there are some not so violent transitions.

This transition from capitalism to socialism and communism is life's way of resolving the main contradiction of our times—the contradiction expressed in the class struggle and the world revolutionary process, giving birth on a world scale to the two social systems—socialism and capitalism. Only the class contradiction gives rise to this process. Only the transition to socialism will remove this, the main obstacle to human progress.

It is the anti-capitalist and anti-imperialist forces which now determine the overall course of human events. The process of transition from capitalism to socialism has resulted in over one-third of the world's people building their lives within socialist societies. It has resulted in national independence for most of the world's countries and peoples. It has given rise to powerful working-class revolutionary movements in all corners of the world. It has resulted in capitalism being repeatedly defeated.

These revolutionary forces block US imperialism in Vietnam. They have forced this most powerful of all imperialist states to admit that it cannot win a military or political victory there.

The powerful world socialist system of states and, in the first place, the Soviet Union, the working-class movements in the capitalist world and the world-wide national liberation movements—these are now the main movers of history.

It must be acknowledged that in recent years the progressive forces have suffered a series of setbacks, for instance, in Ghana and in Indonesia. They are serious and they are costly. They must be carefully studied. They have resulted in the re-establishment of dangerous relationships with the imperialist countries. But they have not resulted in the restoration of colonialism.

The imperialist and nationalistic influences on some working-class Parties have also weakened the revolutionary process. This is a negative factor but it cannot fundamentally change the balance of world forces.

If one takes note of all the factors—negative and positive—influencing the process of transition from capitalism to socialism, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the

thrust of the elevation remains upward. It has not been and will not be reversed.

Is not the defeat for the objectives of US imperialism in Vietnam and socialist Cuba's rebuff to every possible kind of US aggression, including the unfreezing of its economic blockade and its successful building of socialism 90 miles off the US shores an important plus factor on the scales of history in favour of socialism? When you fly to Florida on a clear night you can see the lights of a socialist land from the window of your plane.

Is not the continuing unprecedented economic, military and scientific growth of the socialist world a key element in assessing the international situation?

Or consider the continuing growth of the national liberation movements, or the progress along the non-capitalist road of development in Algeria, the United Arab Republic, Burma and Syria and many other countries.

Israel's military action has failed to help US imperialism achieve its special aim of overthrowing the anti-imperialist governments in Arab countries. On the contrary, it has given new impetus to the unity of the anti-imperialist forces in the Middle East.

The continuing growth of the revolutionary forces in Chile, Venezuela, Argentina, Brazil, Colombia, Ecuador, Uruguay and other South and Central American countries is an important factor in assessing the world balance of forces. Similarly essential is a correct assessment of the general strike in France in 1968 and the developments in Italy with its tremendous upsurge of struggle.

The question of how to assess the forces and mass movement trends of the moment is not a matter of abstract interest. It is on this basis that we determine which policies are realistic and which are not and decide which strategy and tactics are correct and which are not. An overestimation of the negative factors of one phenomenon or another leads to tactics of retreat, to a weakening of the forces, to a negative assessment of the process of radicalisation in our own country. This not only leads to defeat but serves as a shield for the opportunists, who overrate the strength of the enemy.

The Moscow Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties took place at a very important juncture in world development. Powerful revolutionary processes are unfolding

throughout the world. *The present phase is characterised by growing possibilities for a further advance of the revolutionary and progressive forces. At the same time, the dangers brought about by imperialism are mounting.*

Imperialism is not now the dominant world force. It cannot regain its initiative. It cannot reverse world development and stop the world revolutionary process. But US imperialism has not given up its long-standing dream of an "American Century". To this end it squanders nearly a hundred billion dollars of taxpayers' money every year. To this end it piles nuclear overkill on top of overkill. To this end it is planning on spending 500 billion dollars on the ABM system. To this end it annually spends 5 billion dollars to maintain 3,401 military bases in 33 foreign countries, not counting the cost of the war in Vietnam.

The concentration of naval and air power off the coast of People's Korea creates a new flashpoint of world tension.

US imperialism remains the chief danger to the independence of peoples and nations. It has heightened the danger to world peace everywhere. It is the centre of the world forces of reaction fighting socialism. Its aggressive economic policies are a menace to the independence of the developing countries.

The US Government talks of negotiating peace in Vietnam while it continues to escalate the war and push for the ABM system.

West German imperialism, which is motivated by its own greedy ambitions, has the backing of US imperialism. Israel continues its aggression against the Arab peoples, doing so with the backing of US imperialism and the arms it supplies. US imperialism continues its policy of aggression against Cuba. It is penetrating the African, Asian and Latin American countries.

The documents of the Moscow Meeting state that the social and political instability of the capitalist system has increased and that the socio-political crisis is shaking many countries, evidence of this being the powerful strike movements in France and Italy, the expanding struggle in Spain, the class battles throughout the capitalist world.

The policies of military aggression are being continued, and because of this the crisis of imperialism has deepened. This crisis may be most clearly traced on the example of the United States, the strongest link of imperialism. What is

the strategy of American big business today in economic policy? What pressures affect its course? What is it trying to accomplish?

First, it is trying to slow down the economy. It wants the investment boom to end. Every statement of the President's economic advisers makes it clear that this is no short-term move, but a strategy for a whole period of years, running well into the next decade. It is its answer to the problems growing out of the new epoch.

Certainly, to slow down the economy will undermine the long-term position of US imperialism in the world. And yet powerful pressures drive the US in that direction. There is the crisis of the dollar. Every year the United States suffers a deficit of some billions of dollars in its international payments. And every year it loses more of its shrinking stock of gold. And vice versa. So the bankers and the international investment corporations prefer to sacrifice the domestic economy to maintaining a little longer their international financial position.

While this effort to slow down the domestic economy at the workers' expense is being made, US imperialist holdings overseas keep climbing. The Government has already removed even the minor restrictions on capital investment abroad. In place of solely national enterprises, there have emerged on a large scale multi-national industrial corporations with plants and production in dozens of countries.

George Ball, a prominent figure in the State Department under Kennedy and Johnson, and now a partner in Lehman Brothers, recently wrote an article called "Making World Corporations into World Citizens". It is accompanied by a table ranking the countries and corporations of the world in terms of total money power. General Motors, for example, is larger than all but 17 of the world's countries. Standard Oil (NJ) and Ford are larger than South Africa. General Electric is larger than Greece. And so on. Altogether, the foreign empires of US big business are larger than the total national product of any other capitalist country.

While doing everything they can to swell still further this overseas empire, the US monopolists are striving to hold back economic development in their own country.

For US capitalism this is a totally new phenomenon. It has never before been forced to resort to such a policy except

partially and for short periods. Now it is going all the way, and for a long time to come.

A crazy situation? Yes—but only in the sense that capitalism is a crazy system—a system on the way out, one that is losing its internal coherence, one that can no longer resolve its crises, but only manoeuvre increasingly as they deepen. Today the United States is losing ground in economic competition with Japan, the FRG and other capitalist countries.

The greatest battle of our times, that is determining the course of all human events, is the historic contest now going on between the two world systems—capitalism and socialism. In this conflict, the struggle for the minds of men is crucial. It is my firm conviction that capitalism is now losing this most important aspect of the battle. In the world today it is difficult to find an open, unashamed defender of capitalism, and there are no defenders of US capitalism anywhere. The big debate throughout the world is about what kind of socialism is desirable, not about whether socialism is desirable or not. Capitalism is on the defensive, and ideas for the advancement of human society come more and more from the socialist sector of the world.

The competition between the two world systems in the fields of industry, technology and science is now entering a new stage. Socialism has now overcome the handicap of the industrial and technological backwardness that it inherited from the past. From this point on it will compete with capitalism from the broad, modern industrial base that it has achieved. Consequently, the ground rules of the competition between the two systems have changed. Up to this point the score was measured by maximum productive capacity. New technology is making overcapacity or at least sufficient capacity increasingly a permanent feature of society. Thus the question of how much a system can produce is turning into a moot question. Instead, what is going to emerge as the central point of the competition is what a social system does with this unlimited industrial capacity.

From our own experience we already know what automation has brought society under capitalism. It has aggravated the employment problem for unskilled and semi-skilled workers.

Automation has created a new permanent army of unemployed, sharply curtailed employment possibilities for

youth generally and closed the door to employment of Negro, Puerto-Rican and Mexican-American youth.

A by-product of technological progress in the USA is the growth of economically depressed areas, an example being the ridges of poverty in Kentucky and West Virginia.

As machines replace men in production, the hours of work should be correspondingly reduced for all. This is exactly what is being done in the socialist countries and it is in these countries, therefore, that automation is considered a great blessing for all. In the capitalist economy, however, it is something to be feared by workers. As the machine replaces man in production it reduces his wages and consequently his purchasing power. This creates the dilemma of too much capacity and not enough consumption. A distinction between the two world systems is that capitalism is developing towards increasing overcapacity and underconsumption and thus towards an ever greater polarisation of poverty and affluence, while socialism is developing towards increasing capacity geared to abundance for all.

Ever since the emergence of the world's first socialist state the concept "socialism" has been causing people to ask many questions. The nature of these questions changes constantly and this change reveals a shift in the attitude of millions of people. Fifty years ago the question often put was: "How soon will the Bolshevik experiment collapse?" Thirty years ago it was: "Will socialism work?" By ten years ago the question had become: "How well does socialism work?" Now, more and more, the question asked is: "How come it works so well?" And there is a companion question: "How come it works better than capitalism?" I think this question will become ever louder and more demanding of answers.

The answer, of course, is no mystery to Marxists. Irreconcilable contradictions are the undoing of any social system, and capitalism is built around such contradictions. When the 70 million Americans who do not have the means to buy even the minimum of subsistence read about surpluses of food and clothing, for them the contradictions of capitalism are a stark reality.

For years the peace forces in the United States have been demanding spending for welfare, not warfare. But they could show little success. The bulk of the trade union movement stood aside from this struggle, or was misled by the monopoly-inspired slogan of "guns and butter".

Now this is changing. Everybody can see by now that the swollen military budget is an instrument for swelling profits and a prime cause of all the crises affecting our people, from the crisis of the cities to the debt crisis and the crisis of taxes. Important sections of the trade union movement are demanding a real cut in military spending, together with a real increase in spending for the social needs of the working people. This is beginning to give the trade union struggles a new direction. The struggles around these issues are entering a more meaningful phase because the working class is becoming increasingly involved. On these issues there is much in common between the interests of the shop workers and those of professionals, white-collar people, farmers and small businessmen.

The key to victory on these fronts is the coalition of these forces, with the working class in the lead. That is what the idea of the anti-monopoly coalition is all about.

The experience of many Communist Parties shows that the idea of the democratic anti-monopoly struggle is central in defining their strategic aims. The choice of the anti-monopoly concept as the basis of our strategy is not an arbitrary one. It is dictated by our Marxist understanding of the basic character of present-day capitalist society. Those who wish to reject it reject also, whether they like it or not, the Marxist conception of the capitalist social structure.

A classical feature of revisionism is its rejection of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The line runs as follows: "We accept such fundamental Marxist-Leninist concepts as the class struggle, but we believe the idea of the proletarian dictatorship must be discarded as being no longer valid." But scientific theory is not a mere collection of propositions from which one can choose as one selects food items in a cafeteria. It is a logically interconnected body—a chain—of propositions in which one emerges as the necessary conclusion from another. Thus the idea of working-class political rule as the necessary basis of socialism flows inevitably from the Marxist conception of the class struggle. One cannot be discarded without discarding the other.

By the same token, the concept of the anti-monopoly movement and alliance emerges as a necessary consequence of the basic features of the monopoly stage of capitalism and especially of the dominance of state-monopoly capital-

ism, which marks the capitalist social structure today. The rise of monopoly and state-monopoly capitalism gives birth to a new contradiction—that between monopoly and the people, growing out of and superimposed on the basic class conflict. And this leads inevitably to the anti-monopoly character of all democratic struggles today, and hence to the concept of an anti-monopoly movement, intertwined with the struggle for working-class political power.

Those who would reject the anti-monopoly concept proceed from two lines of argument. The first of these downgrades and discards the democratic struggle and the great mass of people who are involved in that struggle, and calls for a “pure” revolutionary strategy—for an “anti-capitalist” or “anti-imperialist” strategy. It pits these “revolutionary” strategies against the allegedly “non-revolutionary” anti-monopoly strategy. It is adherence to such a “non-revolutionary” strategy, say these upholders of “pure” revolution, that makes the Party itself a conservative, no longer revolutionary organisation. They refuse to see the inter-relationship of the democratic anti-monopoly struggle to the revolutionary struggle for socialism.

Views of this kind distort the attitude of the Communists to the democratic movements. “Theoreticians” of this brand maintain that the Communists call for postponing the struggle for socialism until the democratic struggles are won. But this is sheer nonsense. The fact is that the development of the anti-monopoly coalition as a political force is impossible without the development of a powerful Left, without simultaneously advancing the class consciousness of the workers and building a socialist-conscious contingent within their ranks. The very process of radicalisation is the necessary foundation for developing the anti-monopoly movement. The fight for socialism thus develops within the heart of the democratic struggles. The two are inseparable. The task before us is that of mastering the art of making socialism a real, living issue within the context of the democratic struggles. As Lenin often pointed out, there is no such thing as a “pure” revolution. He ridiculed the idea that “one army lines up in one place and says, ‘We are for socialism’, and another, somewhere else and says, ‘We are for imperialism’, and that will be a social revolution!”*

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, pp. 355-56.

The result of looking for "purity" is in fact to abandon the democratic struggle against the monopolies, into which growing masses of people are being drawn. Without our participation, without our being in the very forefront of the democratic struggle, the fight for socialism inevitably degenerates into mere propagandising and preaching, into the building of narrow, sterile sects. The placing of the democratic struggle as in contradiction to the struggle for socialism can only lead in one direction—towards the bog of ultra-Leftism and Trotskyism.

The second line of opposition sees only the existence of individual democratic struggles and rejects any idea of their integrated, anti-monopoly character.

The anti-monopoly concept has been a matter of long debate in the world communist movement. Certain Left-sectarian elements have been against it. In their attacks on the fraternal Communist Parties of France, Italy, the USA and other countries they underscored the attitude of the Communists towards the anti-monopoly struggle.

Most of the opposition to the anti-monopoly idea is based on an overall rejection of the fundamental Marxist concept of intermediate and strategic goals.

The idea of intermediate goals is that we walk with, talk with and unitedly fight jointly with the masses for an objective that we have to reach anyway before we reach our goal of socialism. We do so with people who are not now ready to start the march for socialism. In fact most of them are convinced that they will part company with us when the halfway goals are reached. But the inner logic of struggle is such that we can put forward the end goal and carry the masses along with us. Whenever possible we should have Left contingents, but as a part of the march. We should have a Party contingent—but as a part of the march, far enough in front to lead the way, close enough to the masses so as to be able to talk and walk with them. We can be close enough only if we can say: We are with you in our united efforts in reaching our common goals. This is a fact of life and the only way to the end goal—socialism.

Why an anti-monopoly concept? Why not anti-something else? Because, in our opinion, it provides the best possible way of drawing to our side the masses fighting monopoly oppression but who do not yet see that this oppression is part and parcel of the capitalist system.

The very development of monopoly capitalism demonstrates that our concept is correct. The top financial-industrial dynasties of the United States are fiercely fighting among themselves for control and domination of the nation. There is no other capitalist country in the world where the anti-monopoly struggle has as deep a meaning as in the USA, and nowhere else has it reached such a level of development. The essence of the nature and aims of state-monopoly capitalism should be explained to the masses with the USA as the example.

Lenin had urged the Marxists to study the specific conditions in each country in order to determine the path and direction of the struggle to achieve the revolutionary objective. No Marxist views the path of winning the majority of the working class for socialism as a path without zigzags and turns, without victories and defeats, without advances and retreats. Nor does the path always remain the same. Should conditions change, the path may require revision. During World War I, for example, the path indicated by the Russian Bolsheviks was that of turning the imperialist war into civil war through the struggle against one's own capitalist government. In the thirties, with the rising threat of fascism and a new world war, Communists fought to establish a broad popular front to prevent the outbreak of war and halt the advance of fascism. So, today, the rise of state-monopoly capitalism—the fusion of the power of the financial oligarchy with the power of the state to maximise monopoly profits by robbing the overwhelming majority of the population—confronts the Marxists with the necessity of finding the forms through which to unite all who feel the brunt of monopoly domination. Under these conditions, the economic, political and social interests of the working class necessarily coincide with the interests of other strata of the population, providing the basis for bringing into being a democratic alliance in the struggle against monopoly power.

As was stressed by the June 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: "The desire of the working masses to effect a radical change in the economic and social system based on the exploitation of man is growing ever stronger. The big battles of the working class in a number of capitalist countries are undermining the power of the monopolies, intensifying the instability and contradictions of capitalist society. These struggles foreshadow new class

battles which could lead to fundamental social change, socialist revolution, and the establishment of the power of the working class in alliance with other segments of the working people.”*

Today the question of proletarian internationalism plays an exceptionally vital role and becomes one of the key problems of the development of the world communist and working-class movement.

The meetings that were held in preparation for the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties played a positive role in this sense by indicating the path to resolving the most diverse problems and settling differences.

In regard to the relations between the socialist states, the view is that it is necessary to combine the principle of national sovereignty with the defence of the common interests against imperialism and with mutual economic assistance. The same is essential for the relations between Communist and Workers' Parties. The national and international responsibilities of each Communist Party are indivisible. Communists are both patriots and internationalists. They reject both national narrow-mindedness and the negation or underestimation of national interests.

In this connection I must deal with two arguments which are directed against these concepts. One is the argument that the CPSU is for “limited sovereignty” of socialist nations. This is a repetition of capitalist propaganda intended to discredit the Soviet Union and divide Communists. Throughout its long history the Soviet Union has been the foremost fighter for the independence and full sovereignty of nations. This is borne out by the example of Vietnam, Cuba, the Arab countries and many other states.

With regard to Czechoslovakia justice demands the acknowledgement that no nation has done more for its independence than the USSR. The Soviet Union resolutely declared its readiness to defend Czechoslovakian independence in 1938, when the US, France and Great Britain betrayed it. In 1945 the Soviet Union liberated Czechoslovakia from nazi occupation at the cost of 140,000 Soviet soldiers, who lie buried in Czechoslovakian soil. In 1968,

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 24.

together with other Warsaw Treaty nations, it went to the aid of socialist Czechoslovakia against the dangers of subversion by anti-socialist elements linked with world imperialism.

Lenin bitterly assailed those who view things only from the standpoint of one's own country without reckoning with the interests of socialism on a world-wide scale. He wrote that a Marxist, a revolutionary proletarian must argue "not from the point of view of 'my' country (for that is the argument of a wretched, stupid, petty-bourgeois nationalist who does not realise that he is only a plaything in the hands of the imperialist bourgeoisie), but from the point of view of *my share* in the preparation, in the propaganda, and in the acceleration of the world proletarian revolution.

"That is what internationalism means."*

Is there not a socialist community indeed? Are not the socialist states bound together by agreements of economic, political and military aid in pursuit of common objectives of building socialism and communism and strengthening the world socialist system? Does not socialist internationalism call for the utmost unity of the socialist community? This community is the chief and most decisive factor in the struggle against imperialism. The fraternal socialist countries are united by a common ideology, a common socio-economic structure and common goals—the building of socialism and communism. They are not divided by antagonistic interests of ruling classes, as are capitalist states. When divergencies exist it is possible, given the spirit of socialist internationalism, to solve them through comradely discussion and voluntary fraternal co-operation. All the more are we Communists revolted by the actions of those who follow a path of rank nationalism and pursue a divisive policy in the international working-class and revolutionary liberation movement, by those who have whipped up nationalistic feelings to prevent the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties from being held and interfere with its positive results. These attempts, as everybody knows, did not yield the results expected by the nationalistic, divisive elements. The 1969 International Meeting was a major success of the world revolutionary working-class movement.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 287.

Unity of the Marxist-Leninist Parties against imperialism, the common enemy of socialism and the world revolutionary forces, is imperative. Lenin wrote: "Capital is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood is needed.

"We are opposed to national enmity and discord, to national exclusiveness. We are internationalists."*

The documents of the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties give a correct picture of the alignment of forces and indicate a clear prospect for the development of the revolutionary liberation struggle throughout the world: "The world revolutionary movement continues its offensive despite the difficulties and setbacks of some of its contingents. . . . Imperialism has failed to change the general relationship of forces in its favour. . . . Ours is an epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism.

"At present there are real possibilities for resolving key problems of our time in the interests of peace, democracy and socialism, to deal imperialism new blows."**

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

** *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 12.

PART TWO

**THE WORKING CLASS
IN THE VAN
OF THE WORLD
REVOLUTIONARY
MOVEMENT**

I

LENINIST CONCEPT OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY PROCESS AND THE BANKRUPTCY OF ITS "CRITICS"

In its consistent drive to strengthen the unity of the international working-class movement and the whole world anti-imperialist front the class-conscious vanguard of the proletariat is guided by the programme propositions of Leninism. Its strategy, including the line towards the cohesion of all anti-imperialist forces, is founded on the scientific principles evolved by Lenin.

One of the main factors making for the success of the work of Marxists, Lenin always emphasised, is "the combination of revolutionary theory and revolutionary policy".* He insisted on the application of the principle of historicism, a vital methodological principle of Marxism, which implied "a strictly exact and objectively verifiable analysis of the relations of classes and of the concrete features peculiar to each historical situation". This approach, Lenin held, was imperative "for giving a scientific foundation to policy".** Hence the importance of a correct characteristic of the principal stages in the development of the world revolutionary process, the international working-class movement and the history of the class struggle waged by the working people.

Lenin never treated these problems speculatively or abstractly. He dealt with them from the standpoint of charting the political line of the revolutionary working-class and

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 107.

** Ibid., Vol. 24, p. 43.

liberation movement. His theoretical analysis continues, as it did before, to facilitate the choice of the direction of the proletariat's main effort and, correspondingly, the determination of the tasks of all progressive revolutionary movements in conformity with the balance of the class forces in the world at every given period of history. "Only on that basis," Lenin stressed, "i.e., by taking into account, in the first place, the fundamental distinctive features of the various 'epochs'... can we correctly evolve our tactics."*

An all-sided generalisation of the experience gained by the class struggle helps to define more clearly the current and future trends of this movement. For that reason Lenin repeatedly turned to the history of the revolutionary movement and studied its lessons in order to see if the strategy and policy of the proletarian organisations of his day were correct.

The key attributes distinguishing one historical epoch from another are: the main trends of social development and the principal class force standing in the centre of the given epoch. Where the world socialist revolution, its maturing and rate of development, and its motive and principal forces are concerned, the methodological guideline is the teaching of the *epochal mission of the proletariat*, which Lenin ranked among the fundamental conclusions of the founders of scientific communism. He enlarged on the proposition that the working class "is capable of fulfilling the gigantic task that confronts it", namely that of putting an end to class society, by virtue of "the material conditions of large-scale capitalist production" and chiefly "because it is the strongest and most advanced class in civilised societies",** which "expresses economically and politically the real interests of the overwhelming majority of the working people under capitalism".*** He classed the assumption that "all 'working people' are equally capable of doing this work"**** as an illusion typical of non-proletarian socialism.

Showing the leading trends of socio-political and class development, he never linked the victory of the world socialist revolution with a "purely" proletarian struggle. He

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 145.

** Ibid., Vol. 29, p. 421.

*** Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 274.

**** Ibid., Vol. 22, p. 356.

pictured this revolution as the unfolding of various streams of the world-wide revolutionary process stimulated by the struggle of the international working class. "Whoever expects a 'pure' social revolution," he wrote, "will *never* live to see it. Such a person pays lip-service to revolution without understanding what revolution is." The socialist revolution "*cannot be* anything other than an outburst of mass struggle on the part of all and sundry oppressed and discontented elements", it is inconceivable "without revolts by small nations in the colonies and in Europe, without revolutionary outbursts by a section of the petty bourgeoisie *with all its prejudices*".* Socialism, therefore, "will by no means immediately 'purge' itself of petty-bourgeois slag".**

The theoretical and methodological principles evolved by Lenin for the study of the world revolutionary process have now become especially topical because in the ideological and political struggle world developments have brought to the fore the question of the social forces behind human progress and, chiefly, the question of the role played by the international working class. The aggravation of the class struggle on a global scale and the further deepening of the contradictions between imperialism and socialism, between the monopoly bourgeoisie and the broad masses at the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism have everywhere heightened interest in the question: What class stands in the centre of the epoch and determines its main content and main trend of development? This is a basic social problem, whose scientific analysis gives Marxist revolutionaries a clear understanding of the strategic and tactical tasks of the present-day world revolutionary process.

The concept of the world revolutionary process, formulated by Lenin, is synthesised in condensed form in his periodisation of the principal epochs of new and latest history and the major periods in the development of the international revolutionary liberation movement. When we study Lenin's periodisation it is important to bear in mind his method of building it up. Its point of departure is that on the research level chronology is relatively conventional. Inability to apply it flexibly breaks the living social tissue. Speaking of the division of historical epochs, Lenin pointed

* Ibid., p. 355.

** Ibid., p. 356.

out: "Here, of course, as everywhere in Nature and society, the lines of division are conventional and variable, relative, not absolute. We take the most outstanding and striking historical events only approximately, as milestones in important historical movements."^{*}

In many ways the historical division into epochs and periods depends on the object of study and, therefore, rests on different bases and criteria (socio-economic, class, political, ideological, and so forth). Thus in Lenin's works there is a variable chronology of the revolutionary epochs and periods of modern and latest history in accordance with the genesis of the historical phenomenon being studied by Lenin. Whether he chronologises the history of capitalism, the history of Marxism or the history of the national colonial revolutions his approach is that of the strategist of the proletarian revolution—he studies the formation and development of the working class, the fusion of the struggle of its national contingents into an integrated international movement and its gradual conversion into the main factor of the world revolutionary process.

He wrote: "The chief thing of the doctrine of Marx is that it brings out the historic role of the proletariat as the builder of socialist society. Has the course of events all over the world confirmed this doctrine since it was expounded by Marx?"^{**} In this context he studied the world revolutionary process at its different stages of development, chiefly from the angle of the world proletariat's mounting influence on the course of world history. He analysed this process as the objective foundation of the growth and unity of all revolutionary forces, singling out the following major milestones along this road.

1. The epoch from the Great French Revolution to the Franco-Prussian War or to the Paris Commune, which "completed this development of bourgeois changes"^{***}—(1789-1871). This, he defined, was the epoch "of the rise of the bourgeoisie, of its triumph, of the bourgeoisie on the upgrade, an epoch of bourgeois-democratic movements in general and of bourgeois-national movements in particular,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 146.

** Ibid., Vol. 18, p. 582.

*** Ibid., p. 583.

an epoch of the rapid breakdown of the obsolete feudal-absolutist institutions".*

In the period of pre-monopoly capitalism, when as a class the bourgeoisie had not exhausted its relatively progressive role, capitalist society, as the founders of scientific communism pointed out, was "more and more splitting up into two hostile camps, into two great classes directly facing each other: Bourgeoisie and Proletariat" ***

In this period there was a notable growth of the socio-political importance of the struggle waged by the working class. This was convincingly demonstrated by the first independent battles of the proletariat, particularly the uprisings of the Lyons weavers in 1831 and 1834; the Chartist movement and the first large strikes by the working class in Britain; the participation of workers in the revolutions of 1848, especially the June uprising of the Paris proletariat, which Lenin described as the first great civil war between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie.*** Moreover, as Lenin wrote, the "shooting of the workers by the republican bourgeoisie in Paris in the June days of 1848 finally revealed that the proletariat *alone* was socialist by nature".**** As a whole, the period until 1848, singled out by Lenin as the first important stage of the development of the international working-class movement, witnessed the birth of socialist ideas and the first steps in the class struggle.*****

The turning point in the development of the world proletariat's revolutionary struggle was the new period that followed the European revolutions of 1848. This period, Lenin wrote, "ended with the complete victory of Marxism, the collapse (especially after the Revolution of 1848) of all pre-Marxian forms of socialism, and the separation of the working class from petty-bourgeois democracy and its entry upon an independent historical path".*****

At the close of the epoch of bourgeois democratic revolutions, the gigantic ideological, theoretical, organisational and political work accomplished by Marx and Engels, the teachers and leaders of the world proletariat, led to the

* Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 146.

** Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1969, p. 109.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 309.

**** Ibid., Vol. 18, p. 583.

***** Ibid., Vol. 19, p. 295.

***** Ibid.

establishment of the First International (1864-72), which laid "the foundation of an international organisation of the workers for the preparation of their revolutionary attack on capital,"* the "foundation of the proletarian, international struggle for socialism"***.

The realisation that the task of overthrowing capitalism and achieving the socialist reorganisation of the world was a common international task of the world proletariat posed the vanguard of the proletariat with the question of what attitude to adopt towards the other class and social groups. Marx and Engels, who had rallied round themselves the first cohort of proletarian revolutionaries, directed the working class towards an alliance with broad democratic forces, particularly with the peasants. In the event this policy was successful, Marx wrote, "*the proletarian revolution will obtain that chorus without which its solo song becomes a swan song in all peasant countries*"***.

With the proletariat's conversion from a "class in itself" into a "class for itself", and with its revolutionary growth, the bourgeoisie gradually lost its role as the predominant force in bourgeois democratic reforms, coalesced with reactionary feudal elements and increasingly became a factor holding up social progress. A growing imprint was being made on the development of European and world history by the class battles of the proletariat.

2. The next historical epoch embraces the period from the 1870s to the Great October Socialist Revolution.

This was the epoch of free enterprise capitalism's evolution into monopoly capitalism. The new features in the world economy—the rapid development of joint-stock companies and trusts; the growing role of stock exchanges and banks in both industry and the export of capital; the struggle for spheres of influence and the carving-up of colonies—were accompanied by an intensification of reaction all along the line in both the home and foreign policy of the bourgeoisie.

This epoch of world history was ushered in by a heroic uprising of the French proletariat, which set up its own power in the very heart of Europe. The Paris Commune not

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 306.

** Ibid., p. 307.

*** Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 484.

only demonstrated that the antagonism between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie had become the basic social contradiction but strikingly showed the whole world that the working class could seize power and administer society. "The Commune," Lenin wrote, "taught the European proletariat to pose concretely the tasks of the socialist revolution."*

The Commune was the world's first experience of the dictatorship of the proletariat. The working class showed that it was a political force that could achieve not only specific class aims but carry out democratic, national tasks. In other words, it was becoming a class which by its example was carrying with it increasingly larger sections of the nation and translating into reality the task of leading the democratic opposition to the bourgeois regime, a task that was theoretically formulated during the preceding stage of the struggle.

Summing up the onward sweep of the international working-class movement in this epoch, Lenin noted that it was a period "of the formation, growth and maturing of mass Socialist parties with a proletarian class composition. This period is characterised by the tremendous spread of socialism, the unprecedented growth of all kinds of organisations of the proletariat, and the all-round preparation of the proletariat in the most varied fields for the fulfilment of its great historic mission."**

At the same time, as Lenin pointed out, the proletarian movement's growth "in *breadth*" led to a temporary drop "of the revolutionary level".***

Another factor that weakened the working-class struggle in the principal capitalist countries was that by virtue of a series of objective reasons it was isolated from the national liberation movement of the peoples oppressed by imperialism. Called upon to establish socialism on a world scale, the proletariat was only becoming predominant among the progressive forces within the framework of individual European capitalist countries. While after the defeat of the Paris Commune, as Lenin put it, the "West entered a phase of 'peaceful' preparations for the changes to come", the "East had not yet risen" to bourgeois revolutions.**** Individual

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 13, p. 477.

** Ibid., Vol. 19, pp. 295-96.

*** Ibid., Vol. 29, p. 306.

**** Ibid., Vol. 18, p. 583.

links and torrents of the world revolutionary process were, in many cases, still developing in parallel, spontaneously groping for the road to mutual support and assistance, which only subsequently could acquire more conscious and organised forms. In that period the absence of effective interaction by the different progressive, anti-imperialist forces active in various parts of the world obviously affected the strength of their assault on imperialism.

The general course of the world revolutionary struggle, primarily the processes in the mass working-class and Social-Democratic movement that began in the period of the Paris Commune, were given a new direction by the revolution of 1905 in Russia, which, as a result of the uneven economic and political development of the capitalist countries in the epoch of imperialism, became the centre of the *world proletarian movement*. Summing up the significance of the events of this period, particularly of the sharp growth of the struggle of the masses everywhere, Lenin wrote: "The revolutionary movement in various European and Asian countries has latterly made itself felt so weightily that we see before us the fairly clear outlines of a new and incomparably higher stage in the international proletarian struggle."^{*}

The impact of the Russian revolution of 1905-07 was felt all over the world. It was proved in practice that in the historical movement the strength of the working class was incomparably greater than its numerical proportion of the population as a whole. The proletariat of Russia was the principal force of this democratic revolution. The fact that the working class became the leading revolutionary force in the struggle of the broad masses against tsarism, for social emancipation and the abolition of national oppression affected the course and specific forms of the mass struggle itself.

This enhancement of the role of the working class still further accentuated in the political and ideological struggle the question of the proletariat's allies and of the growing influence exercised by the ideas of socialism among broad, including non-proletarian, sections of the people. Leninism pressed for a stronger alliance of the working class with all the exploited, oppressed masses of town and country and fought consistently on two fronts: against the Right op-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 15, p. 182.

portunism and tail-endism of the Economists and Mensheviks, and against "Left"-sectarian trends. Lenin warned against neglect of the ultimate socialist aims of the proletariat and against sectarian disregard of the democratic demands and aspirations of its allies. Criticising, for example, the ideological and theoretical platform of the Socialist-Revolutionaries, he stressed (touching, in particular, on their concept of the "stability of the working peasant economy", which was to some extent reminiscent of the Proudhonist, Bakuninist and other doctrines of petty-bourgeois socialism) that "the Russian 'Socialist-Revolutionaries', who are wholly in thrall of these ideas of petty-bourgeois Narodism, inevitably turn out to be 'birds of a feather' with the European reformists and opportunists, who, when they would be consistent, inevitably arrive at Proudhonism"*. At the same time, he insisted that the Party learn to "extract the sound and valuable kernel of the sincere, resolute, militant democracy of the peasant masses from the husk of Narodnik utopias",** and support the just struggle of the working peasants for land.

Lenin was particularly anxious that the proletariat should have correct relations with the working intelligentsia, advanced students and other forces fighting for social progress. His injunctions on this issue are vital today when in many capitalist countries the working-class movement is faced with the pressing problem of correctly coordinating the proletarian class struggle with the growing democratic movements. Lenin denounced the attempts at artificially counterposing "purely proletarian" day-to-day demands to the tasks of the political, including democratic, struggle, to the tasks of progressive culture, the education of the masses and so on. While noting that the class interests of the proletariat had to be steadfastly upheld, he underscored the danger of Makhayevism and other trends alien to scientific socialism. The aim of these trends was to drive a wedge between the working class and progressive intellectuals.***

* Ibid., Vol. 6, pp. 434-35.

** Ibid., Vol. 18, p. 359.

*** The ideological and political credo of Makhayevism (which came into being at the turn of the century first in Siberia and then became quite widespread among the backward sections of the working people in other regions of Russia) was most succinctly expressed in Makhayevsky's books *Worker by Brain* (1898), *Bankruptcy of 19th-Century Social-*

As early as 1902-03 Lenin characterised Makhayevism as being in opposition to the revolutionary working-class movement.* Then and subsequently, Lenin stressed the need for a "most resolute ideological struggle against the syndicalist and Makhayevist deviation. . .".**

Leninism linked the proletariat's successful preparation for the coming decisive battles for socialism with the utmost promotion of an effective alliance of the leading class with the peasants, the urban middle strata, the working intelligentsia, and all oppressed nations.

The experience of the revolution of 1905 immeasurably enriched the international working-class movement. It was the first profoundly popular revolution of the epoch of imperialism in which the influence of the proletariat and its forms of struggle were manifested more forcefully than ever before. This experience was comprehensively analysed and generalised in Lenin's immortal works.

The various torrents of the world revolutionary liberation struggle began to interact more vigorously under the impact of the Russian revolution. Analysing one of the trends of this interaction, Lenin wrote: "...a new source of great world storms opened up in Asia. The Russian revolution was followed by revolutions in Turkey, Persia and China.

ism and *The Bourgeois Revolution and the Workers' Cause* (1905-06), the collected volume *Working-Class Conspiracy* (1908) and also in *What, Indeed, Is the Intelligentsia?* (1907), *Results of Parliamentarism, Results and Prospects of the Working-Class Movement in the West and in Russia* and in other books and pamphlets. Those who expounded this trend maintained that the revolutionary Marxism of their day and revisionism (between which they drew no distinction) were equally a betrayal of genuinely proletarian socialism, that "purely working-class" interests were incompatible with political, democratic demands. They branded scientific socialism a "monstrous deceit" of the workers by the intellectuals. Hence their theory that the proletariat had to fight the intelligentsia and the latter's attempts to draw it into the democratic political struggle. In spite of their vociferous revolutionary verbiage they sought to reduce the tasks of the working-class movement to individual day-to-day material demands of the industrial proletariat, counterposing these demands to the struggle for the ideals of socialism. The intelligentsia, they said, were using these ideals to dupe the workers.

Similar fabrications and a similarly harmful trend was seen in the stand adopted by some other adversaries of Leninism. Those who, like the Trotskyites, understand the revolution neither in a Marxist nor in a Leninist way, continue to speak demagogically about the "class interests of the proletariat".

* V. I. Lenin. *Collected Works*, Vol. 6, p. 300.

** Ibid., Vol. 42, p. 282.

It is in this era of storms and their 'repercussions' in Europe that we are now living."*

In formulating the concept of the interaction of the international working-class movement with the national liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples, Lenin underscored the leading role of the proletarian revolutions as heralds of the impending communist renewal of the world.

He developed his concept of the world revolutionary process at the beginning of the 20th century in struggle chiefly with the opportunists of the Second International, who, in view of the absence of revolution in the West, preached "social peace" and maintained that revolutionary storms could not break out under bourgeois democracy.

Lenin's theory of world revolution was also directed against "people who were inattentive to the conditions for preparing and developing the mass struggle", people "driven to despair and to anarchism by the lengthy delays in the decisive struggle against capitalism in Europe".**

Lenin emphatically rejected the subjectivist view that the East was best prepared for the acceptance and implementation of the socialist revolution. "Does that mean, then," he wrote in connection with the upsurge of the revolutionary struggle in Asian countries, "that the materialist West has hopelessly decayed and that light shines only from the mystic, religious East? No, quite the opposite. It means that the East has definitely taken the Western path, that new *hundreds of millions* of people will from now on share in the struggle for the ideals which the West has already worked out for itself."***

The entire subsequent period until the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 witnessed a struggle between revolutionary and reformist trends in the international working-class and revolutionary liberation movements, and the mounting influence of Bolshevism. During the First World War, when a political crisis gripped a number of countries in Europe, Lenin perspicaciously pointed out that elements of a revolutionary situation were maturing, that deep-going social upheavals were inevitable and that the world imperialist chain might possibly be broken in one of

* Ibid., Vol. 18, p. 584.

** Ibid.

*** Ibid., p. 165.

its links. In this analysis, too, the central point was Lenin's proposition that the proletariat plays the leading role on the national and international levels. This proposition was formulated on the basis of a scientific generalisation of the trends and prospects of the revolutionary movement throughout the world and, particularly, in Russia, which "matured with exceptional rapidity, and assimilated most eagerly and successfully the appropriate 'last word' of American and European political experience"* . The entire course of international events and Russia's internal development led up to the victorious socialist revolution, which started a new chapter of world history.

3. The contemporary epoch began after the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917 and the world's division into two camps. "The abolition of capitalism and its vestiges," Lenin wrote, "and the establishment of the fundamentals of the communist order comprise the content of the new era of world history that has set in."***

The successful development of the socialist revolution in Russia and the powerful upswing of the world revolutionary movement had a colossal impact on the subsequent course of social progress and confirmed the world-historic role of the proletariat and its ability to build a new society. "Following the Paris Commune," Lenin wrote, "a second epoch-making step was taken."****

With the emergence of the Soviet state the international working-class movement was able, as the founders of scientific communism put it, to begin working on what allowed "achieving the age-old ideals of socialism and the working-class movement".**** Here it was not only a matter of taking the former experience of the world proletariat's struggle into account but also of the further creative development of this experience. The realisation of the proletariat's world-historic mission was now raised to a qualitatively new level. This was strikingly demonstrated by triumphant socialism's purposeful and creative development. Soon after the October Revolution of 1917 Lenin wrote: "We are standing on the shoulders of the Paris Commune" and stressed that Soviet Russia had taken "a step forward in the world development

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 26.

** Ibid., p. 392.

*** Ibid., p. 311.

**** Ibid., Vol. 29, pp. 306-07.

of socialism". Noting the immense international significance of the new type of state, he pointed out: "...the Paris Commune was a matter of a few weeks, in one city, without the people being conscious of what they were doing. The Commune was not understood by those who created it.... We have conditions that enable us to see clearly what we are doing in creating Soviet power."* The international communist movement, which heads the struggle for the revolutionary transition from capitalism to socialism on a global scale, has embarked on the attainment of this great goal.

The epoch of transition from capitalism to socialism, an epoch scientifically analysed by Lenin, falls into a number of basic periods. In generalising the historical road traversed by the world revolutionary movement during the past five decades the Marxist-Leninist Parties single out the following main results of the onward moving revolutionary process.

The triumph of the socialist revolution and the building of socialism in the USSR; the upsurge of the working-class and other mass democratic and national liberation movements in various parts of the world; the formation of Marxist-Leninist Parties in many countries at the initial stage of the general crisis of capitalism (1917-39).

The defeat of fascism in the Second World War; socialism's emergence from the boundaries of one country and the formation of a world community of socialist states; the weakening of imperialism; the collapse of its colonial system; considerable enhancement of the role played by the working class and its organisations in social life; aggravation of various forms of the class struggle on an international scale.

Further change of the balance of world forces at the present stage of the general crisis of capitalism as a result, chiefly, of the increased might and stronger international positions of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, the downfall of colonialism and the emergence of tens of independent national states, the powerful growth, in breadth and depth, of the working-class movement in the citadels of imperialism, and the mounting number of objective and subjective prerequisites for a further sharp upsurge of the anti-monopoly struggle in the capitalist world.

A more concrete analysis of the development of the dif-

* Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 133.

ferent forms of the revolutionary process in the modern epoch is given in other chapters of this monograph. Here it is important to stress that the world-historic mission of the proletariat has been most strikingly shown during the past few decades. The international working class and its main achievement, the socialist system, have moved into the centre of the epoch and their growing influence is determining world social development.

The world's socio-economic development is increasingly influenced by the growing antagonism between the triumphant working class organised as a state and the bourgeoisie organised as a state. *The struggle between the two systems and the anti-imperialist actions of the masses in all the continents mirror the development of the cardinal social contradiction in the world: between the international working class, the world socialist forces and their allies, on the one side, and world capitalism, on the other.*

All the adversaries of Leninism seek to conceal this main class contradiction of the epoch or to misrepresent its character and forms and the ways of resolving it. These attempts have become particularly conspicuous in recent years, especially in connection with the different assessments of the results of the scientific and technological revolution. Misinterpreting these results, the "critics" of scientific socialism preach theories about the beginning of an era witnessing the "fading of the class struggle", the "convergence" of antipodal social systems and the "disappearance" of the working class. Bourgeois reformist ideologists are trying to prove that the development of cybernetics, atomic power engineering, automation and rocketry and the increasing use of electronic computers in production and non-productive spheres, have "shattered the prospects" of the revolutionary working-class movement, arguing that the proletariat is ceding to workers by brain its role as the principal force behind economic, scientific and technological development. Bourgeois and Right-revisionist propagandists (Arnold J. Toynbee, Raymond Aron, Fritz Sternberg, Gunnar Myrdal, Karl Czernetz, Jan Tinbergen and others) have generally branded as "utopian" the Marxist-Leninist proposition about the historic mission of the proletariat, groundlessly maintaining that the theoreticians of scientific communism had "over-rated" the proletariat's potentialities and its possibilities for influencing world social development.

One of the principal aims pursued by the adversaries of Leninism, who gamble on the new phenomena in the economy, the changes in the working-class structure and other effects of scientific and technological progress, is to undermine the people's faith in the inexhaustible revolutionary strength and historic role of the working class, and in its ability to rally round itself all anti-imperialist forces.

However, life shows that concepts of this kind are untenable theoretically, ideologically and politically. Suffice it to say that by the mid-sixties the number of factory and office workers in the world had increased to 540 million. By the sixties the working class had begun to produce three-quarters of the world's social output. Developments show that Lenin was correct when he concluded that the strength of the proletariat "is far greater than the proportion it represents of the total population. That is because the proletariat economically dominates the centre and nerve of the entire economic system"* of society.

A theory in vogue in some Western countries is that the growth of the number of workers by brain is "eroding" the proletariat. This theory does not stand the test of serious criticism. It was Marxism-Leninism that foretold and scientifically proved that the role of various forms of mental and skilled work would grow in proportion to progress in science and technology and that there would be appropriate structural changes in the economy. Moreover, bourgeois reformist ideologists grossly distort the very scientific concept of "working class". They prefer to ignore the Marxist proposition about the "aggregate worker", which covers factory workers engaged in physical labour and people who contribute mental work or fulfil various auxiliary functions in the creation of the product.

Scientific socialism showed the basis of the main social antagonism of the capitalist system. This is the contradiction between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Having determined the socio-economic substance of the relations between factory owners and workers, Marxism-Leninism proved that in the last analysis whatever specific form it acquires the antagonism between capital and labour springing from exploitation predetermines the aggravation of all the main social contradictions of the bourgeois system. As

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 274.

L. I. Brezhnev, General Secretary of the CC CPSU, pointed out at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, the "deep-rooted, truly ineradicable inner contradictions undermining capitalism, chiefly the contradiction between labour and capital, are becoming more acute precisely in our day".*

The colossal intensification of the exploitation of the working class accompanying the development of capitalist society is illustrated by the figures in the following table.

*Wages and Labour Productivity
in Capitalist Countries in 1840-1964
(1900=100)*

Year	Labour productivity	Real wages
1840-1849	40	67
1850-1859	45	65
1860-1869	55	73
1870-1879	70	81
1880-1889	80	90
1890-1899	90	98
1900-1909	110	100
1910-1919	133	98
1920-1929	155	100
1930-1939	197	103
1940-1949	225	110
1950-1959	274	125
1960-1964	331	135

Source: J. Kuczynski, *Die Geschichte der Lage der Arbeiter unter dem Kapitalismus*, Vol. 37, Akademie-Verlag, Berlin, p. 118.

In other words, during the past 125 years labour productivity rose more than eight-fold while real wages only doubled. These figures, as Academician J. Kuczynski justifiably notes, strikingly show "the colossal scale of exploitation".** The exploitation level of the workers in capitalist countries is even more eloquently illustrated in the following table (see p. 143).

A favourite assertion of bourgeois and Social-Democratic authors is that the technological innovations in industry are

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 142.

** J. Kuczynski, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

*Degree of Exploitation of the Working
Class in the Capitalist World*

Year	Degree of exploitation (%)
1850	about 100
1913	about 200
1964	over 700

Source : J. Kuczynski, op. cit. p. 127.

opening the road to a "relaxation" or even the "abolition" of exploitation of the workers by factory owners. They maintain that the modern scientific and technological revolution is "transforming" imperialism and "nullifying" the socio-economic laws of capitalism that had been laid bare by Marxism-Leninism. But these concepts run counter to reality. On the contrary, as the figures in the above tables demonstrate, instead of diminishing the degree of capitalist exploitation continues to increase.

The processes taking place deep in world capitalism in the period of its general crisis are influenced by the class struggle unfolding in the world. At the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in June 1969 it was justifiably pointed out that the "growth of socialism's might, the abolition of colonial regimes and pressure by the working-class movement increasingly influence the inner processes and policies of imperialism. Many important features of modern imperialism can be explained by the fact that it is compelled to adapt itself to new conditions, to the conditions of struggle between the two systems".*

All this affects the socio-economic, ideological and political life of bourgeois society, making its imprint, for example, on specific manifestations and the latest methods of capitalist exploitation, which are often concealed by so-called social partnership, human relations and other forms of "class co-operation". In this light one can also understand some of the changes in the forms of the cyclic development of the capitalist economy (greater asynchronism in the unfolding of the world capitalist cycle, changes in the regularity of the cycles of production, and so on).

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 141.*

Many causes, including the inner laws of capitalism, give rise to these processes. Among them are the accelerating development over the past few decades of state-monopoly trends as a consequence of the higher level of concentration and centralisation of production due to the scientific and technological revolution, and the aggravation of the class struggle. Another major factor is the competition between the two antipodal socio-economic systems.

No matter what methods are used for the state-monopoly regulation of the economy they cannot hide the fact that the exploitation of the working class is on the upgrade, and they cannot resolve the antagonistic contradictions intrinsic to capitalism. On the contrary, these contradictions are, in the last analysis, inescapably reproduced on a new and larger scale and in sharper form. This development of the contradictions of imperialism only intensifies the economic and political instability of the capitalist system, thereby accentuating the need for replacing it.

Thus, with the aggravation of the main social contradictions of the capitalist mode of production—both external and internal—the working class naturally comes forward more and more actively as the force with the mission of breaking up the system of exploitation and building a society without exploitation of man by man.

The communist movement sees in a firm alliance of the working class with other anti-imperialist forces—on both the national and international levels—an earnest of the successful development of the world-wide revolutionary liberation movement. The common interests of the struggle against imperialism, for peace and genuine social progress require effective co-operation between all the principal revolutionary forces and increasing solidarity and reciprocal support among all the contingents of the international liberation movement.

The content and aims of the policy of uniting all revolutionary, progressive forces pursued by the CPSU and fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties are frequently misrepresented by the adversaries of Leninism. They see the sources of this policy in transient, subjective factors and question the indisputable circumstance that this policy is determined not by considerations of the moment but by the principles underlying the strategy of the Marxist-Leninist Parties.

They particularly distort the class nature of this policy.

For example, Arnold J. Toynbee, one of the doyens of modern Western bourgeois reformist historiography, asserts that "the passage of time has also confuted Lenin's doctrine that the industrial proletariat of Russia and of the Western countries is the natural ally of the Asian and African peoples that are being exploited by imperialism, and that communism is the creed that can link together these two wings of the great army of the victimised"* . A method used by many modern bourgeois and social-reformist ideologists is to counterpose the proletariat's national tasks to its international tasks, to pit the main torrents of the world revolutionary liberation movement against each other. For instance, it was none other than Benedict Kautsky, who, in his *The Lenin Heritage* (published in the early 1960s shortly before his death as a series of articles in the Austrian Social-Democratic journal *Die Zukunft*), described the united anti-imperialist front policy charted by Lenin as a "departure from the fundamental principles of Marxism". He maintains that the propositions on this issue, contained in the documents of the modern world communist movement, including the thesis that it is necessary to activate the struggle to foster the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces in the world, are manifestations of the "Leninist revision of Marxism".**

Assertions of this kind are untenable. This is quite obvious despite the efforts of the social-reformist theoreticians to counterpose Leninism to Marxism. Marx and Lenin always acted on the principle that the successful development of the socialist revolution presupposes an effective alliance between the working class and the working peasants, the support of the middle strata in town and country and the intertwining of the proletarian revolutions with the national liberation and other democratic movements.

In the new historical conditions that emerged after the Great October Revolution, the idea of the unity of all revolutionary forces was further amplified, and the material basis for its implementation was provided by the world's first socialist country. "We," Lenin said in 1920, "now stand,

* Arnold J. Toynbee, "Looking Back Fifty Years", in the book *The Impact of the Russian Revolution 1917-1967. The Influence of Bolshevism on the World Outside Russia*, Royal Institute of International Affairs, Oxford University Press, London—New-York—Toronto, 1967, p. 6.

** *Die Zukunft*, No. 5, 1962, p. 154.

not only as representatives of the proletarians of all countries but as representatives of the oppressed peoples as well. A journal of the Communist International... carries the following slogan issued by the Communist International for the peoples of the East: 'Workers of all oppressed peoples, unite!'. . . Of course, the modification is wrong from the standpoint of the *Communist Manifesto*, but then the *Communist Manifesto* was written under entirely different conditions. From the point of view of present-day politics, however, the change is correct."^{*}

It is no accident that Leninism's strategic guidelines calling for consistent efforts to strengthen the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces in the world with the international working-class movement and its main creation, triumphant socialism, playing the leading role are one of the principal targets of a relentless ideological struggle. This is precisely where a dividing line passes between genuine Leninists and all adversaries of Leninism.

In recent years some ideologists of petty-bourgeois national-opportunism and "Left" extremism have been particularly vehement in their attacks on the Leninist programme propositions on the ways of achieving the unity of all the main torrents of the world revolutionary process and on the leading role played by the working class in the world liberation movement. Lenin and all Leninists consistently fought all nationalistic distortions of Marxist principles on this issue (including the adventurist views of the Trotskyites, and also the theories propounded by Manabendra Nath Roy, M. Sultan-Galiyev and others^{**}).

Latently, the ideologists of Trotskyism and other trends of modern "Left" revisionism have reactivated their attempts to distort the Marxist-Leninist theory of the world socialist revolution and intensified their attacks on the Leninist general line of the CPSU and the entire international working-class movement. For instance, the *Manifesto*, adopted in 1961 by the Sixth Congress of the Fourth (Trots-

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 453.

^{**} For a criticism by Lenin and the Communist International of the national-opportunist concepts, which belittle the significance of the struggle waged by the international working class and unfoundedly overrate the role played in the world anti-imperialist struggle by the national liberation movement in Asia see *The Comintern and the East. The Struggle for the Leninist Strategy and Tactics in the National Liberation Movement*, Russ. ed., Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1969.

kyite) International, the Charter of the Milan "Unity Congress" of the Fourth International (1963) and other documents of modern Trotskyism contain the unsubstantiated assertion that the "main centre of the world revolution" has now "shifted to the colonial world". Continuing and enlarging on Trotsky's old anti-Leninist exertions, his ideological successors maintain that at the present stage of social development the vanguard and main force of the world revolution are no longer the international working class and its principal achievement, the world socialist system, but the colonial revolution. While slanderously distorting the class essence not only of the Soviet Union's peace-loving foreign policy but also the foundations of the social system in the socialist countries, the Trotskyites have, in effect, pledged the support of the Fourth International for the anti-Soviet policies of the modern splitters in the working-class movement.

Attention is drawn by the fact that while there is some distinction between old and neo-Trotskyism their anti-Leninist ideological and theoretical platform propounds not only a similar but frequently an identical interpretation of the key problems of the world revolutionary movement and distorts the fundamental Leninist principles underlying the periodisation of the history of that movement. Both trends seek to replace the scientific criteria put forward and substantiated by Lenin with other, purely voluntaristic, unscientific "criteria". In order to see that this is so it is enough to analyse the principles used by the "Left" opportunists for a periodisation of the modern and latest history of the class struggle.

Three periodisations of this history or, to be more exact, of the world revolutionary process from the days of the emergence of Marxism became widespread in Chinese historiography in the 1960s.

According to one of these periodisations, the theory of scientific socialism passed through three stages of development. The first, covering the period from 1848 to 1898, is associated by official Chinese propaganda with the names of Marx and Engels. Then follows the Lenin stage, which the Peking ideologists lengthened to 1935. In 1935, according to this Chinese version, began the new stage in the history of Marxist-Leninist philosophy. Developing this idea, these authors declare that after Lenin's death the world historical

process, the experience of the international communist movement, of socialist revolutions and socialist construction, and also the experience of the anti-imperialist national liberation movements were generalised in a Marxist way only in China.*

It is hardly worth the trouble to prove the untenability of these purely speculative propositions whose sole purpose is to present the "Left" petty-bourgeois revisionism of Marxism-Leninism, dished up as a "universal truth", as the "quintessence of the spirit" of the new epoch.** This concept not only contravenes historical truth but makes a break with the Leninist method of analysing the world revolutionary process. Let us recall Lenin's periodisation of the history of the formation and development of Marxism as given by him in *The Historical Destiny of the Doctrine of Karl Marx*. He linked every stage in the evolution of the theory of scientific socialism and every new theoretical enrichment of that theory with the historical initiative of the world proletariat and saw it as stemming from the experience of the class struggle. It cannot be otherwise because *as a whole Marxism-Leninism is first and foremost a teaching showing the working class as the principal force capable of heading the struggle for the revolutionary overthrow of capitalism and as the creator of the new social system.*

The pattern offered by the "Left" revisionists in effect leaves no room for the historic role of the working class. This only reaffirms that their propagandists (as was justifiably noted by many of the speakers at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties) are pursuing a political line which abandons proletarian internationalism and has lost the class socialist content. This is strikingly demonstrated by the exercises in "theory" by those who aspire to give the nationalistic, divisive policy an ideological foundation.

This is augmented with a similarly demagogic theory "abolishing Eurocentrism" in world history. In the last analysis the proponents of this approach reduce the problem of periodisation to the counterposition of two geographical regions of the world—Europe and Asia.

In their theories the driving force of historical progress

* *Lishih Yanchiu*, No. 5, 1960, pp. 2-3, 37.

** Ibid.

is not the development of the means of production and the corresponding forms of the class struggle but the interaction of the two continents in the quest for "centres" of world history generally and of the world revolutionary struggle in particular in the modern and latest periods of history. They arbitrarily move this "centre" to Asia.*

Moreover, among some of these adversaries of scientific socialism there is a considerable lack of co-ordination as to the criteria for determining this "centre" (mode of production, geographical or state principle, level of the class struggle and so on). Due to this lack of co-ordination, historical development is represented as the decline or ascent of one or another country or region of the world. The substance of this concept was most revealingly stated by the Chinese nationalistic historian Chou Ku-cheng, whose articles were publicised in the Chinese press. In these articles the "struggle against Eurocentrism" was turned into the preaching of openly chauvinistic ideas about the exceptional role of the "yellow race", about its "lofty mission" and "special role" in world history.** According to these views, the whole of human history is represented as a clash between two "civilisations", the Western and the Eastern, as a rotation—from East to West and then again through Russia to the East and to China. Thus, Chou Ku-cheng gives the years 1873 (aggravation of the imperialist struggle for markets) and 1949 (victory of the people's revolution in China) as the boundaries of the latest period of world history. This span of time, which he calls neither modern nor latest history, is, in his opinion, characterised by the USA's "economic domination of Europe" secured during the First World War and then by the formation of a revolutionary centre in Russia after 1917; further, the historical cycle ended with the emergence of the People's Republic of China.***

In this interpretation of history, the economic factor is sometimes in evidence, but only as a struggle for economic domination. The political content of the revolutionary process after 1873 is reduced solely to wars. The authors of patterns of this sort have no idea whatever of politico-economic systems and the class struggle, let alone of the

* *Lishih Yanchiu*, No. 3, 1961, pp. 115, 118-19.

** *Lishih Yanchiu*, No. 2, 1961, p. 37.

*** *Ibid.*

struggle of the international working-class movement against capitalist exploitation.

Under the various criteria of periodisation the "secondary material" relating to the main factor, the revolutionary proletarian torrents of the historical process, do not fit either into the first or second pattern and are, therefore, declared as non-essential and thereby virtually discarded.

There is yet another periodisation pattern which shows the extent to which the "Left" revisionists endeavour to use science as a means of propounding a divisive, chauvinistic policy. According to their own admission, this pattern is based on the propositions propounded in the collection *Long Live Leninism*, which was published in China in 1960. The world communist movement has legitimately assessed this book as the concentrated credo of present-day national-revisionism and "Left" opportunism.

Outwardly, this third concept sounds somewhat more scientific. Its authors claim to review the relationship between the general and the specific in three revolutionary movements of world-historic importance: the Paris Commune of 1871, the Great October Socialist Revolution of 1917, and the people's revolution in China. However, ignoring or distorting the real class content of these great revolutions, the Chinese theoreticians represent the world revolutionary process solely as the gradual and quantitative accumulation of weapons in the hands of the proletariat. They hold that the destiny of past revolutions depended entirely on the quantity of such weapons, that only weapons would determine the destiny of all subsequent social movements, for "the proletariat has to win the right to its own liberation in the theatre of military action".* Citing known facts showing the "excessive generosity" of the French proletarians towards the class enemy and the weak armaments of the Paris Communards, these authors declare that in Russia the role of armaments increased, although, as they put it, in this respect the revolutions of 1905 and 1917 in Russia hardly differed from the European revolutions of the 18th and 19th centuries. They assert that China was the only country where they fully appreciated the importance of weapons "and accorded them the chief place in the

* Chang Chung-shih, "The Paris Commune and the Development of Marxism-Leninism" (*Hsinhua Yuepao*, No. 4, 1961, p. 12).

Chinese revolution".* For that reason, they maintain, world history "stops" with the victory of the Chinese revolution, which they describe as the pinnacle of world revolutionary development. This is bluntly stated, for example, by Li Shu: "Through the victory of the Great October Revolution, the movement started by the Paris workers received its fullest development in China".** By "movement of the Paris workers" Li Shu means a purely military way of achieving the transition to socialism.

In other words, the sole purpose of the references to the experience of all preceding revolutions is to provide, from this aspect also, some "theoretical" foundation for the adventurist theses of the "Left" opportunists.

A study of the past in order to understand the present presupposes, naturally, concrete knowledge not only of what took place in history but also of what is taking place at the present stage of world development. The comparative method of research can only be effective if a number of objective factors and laws, including the factors of time, are taken into consideration. Models for the application of this method were set by the founders of scientific communism, who, as Lenin emphasised, studied "each particular revolutionary situation when they analysed the lessons of the experience of each particular revolution"*** from the angle mainly of its contribution to the general experience of the international revolutionary liberation movement. The "Left" revisionists, however, write off this circumstance and ignore the changes in the balance of world forces which have introduced essential modifications into revolutionary practice.

The nationalistic trend of these concepts is self-evident. They serve the unseemly purpose of justifying an anti-Leninist, divisive, hegemonistic, chauvinistic policy in the international revolutionary movement.

But neither the "theoretical" exercises of the modern national-opportunists nor their practical divisive activities, which play into the hands of world imperialist reaction, can stop the steadily developing trend towards the unity of the world anti-imperialist front.

* Wu Chiang, "Seizure of Power in the Chinese Revolution. 90th Anniversary of the Paris Commune" (*Lishih Yanchiu*, No. 2, 1961, p. 5).

** Li Shu, "Significance of the Principles of the Paris Commune for the Chinese Revolution" (*Hsinhua Yuepao*, No. 4, 1961, p. 15).

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 401.

The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was an important milestone in the drive to strengthen the unity of the world communist movement and all anti-imperialist forces. One of its calls states: "*Peoples of the socialist countries, workers, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly liberated peoples and those who are oppressed, unite in a common struggle against imperialism, for peace, national liberation, social progress, democracy and socialism!*"*

Conforming to the demands of the times, this call is founded on a strictly scientific assessment of the present international situation and stems from the real possibilities and need for strengthening the unity of all the anti-imperialist forces in the world today.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 39.*

II

STRATEGY OF THE WORLD COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

AT THE FIRST STAGE
OF THE GENERAL CRISIS OF CAPITALISM

Steps Taken by Lenin To Unite the International Revolutionary Working-Class Movement on the Basis of Proletarian Internationalism

The unity of the working class founded on proletarian internationalism is one of the fundamental conditions for overthrowing capitalism. The slogan "Workers of all countries, unite!", put forward in the *Manifesto of the Communist Party*, expresses this fundamental idea in a nutshell and reveals its international aspect (international solidarity of the proletariat of all countries in a single anti-capitalist front and the unity of the different national contingents of the working class) and its national aspect (unity of the working-class movement in each country).

In the new epoch started by the Great October Revolution the struggle to implement this great behest of the founders of scientific socialism was headed by the Communist International and guided by the creative genius of Lenin.

Soon after the outbreak of the First World War, when the leaders of the Second International renounced the basic principles of Marxist theory and policy and flouted the idea of proletarian internationalism, Lenin raised the question of renewing the international working-class movement by forming a new revolutionary organisation of the world proletariat. Under the slogan that the "proletarian International has not gone under and will not go under. Notwithstanding all obstacles, the masses of the workers will create a new International",* Lenin started ideological, organisational

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 21, p. 33.

and political preparations for the formation of a Communist International to lead the revolutionary assault on capitalism.* To use his own words, he painstakingly mustered the "tiny nucleus" of the new, Third International, rallying revolutionary Marxists who had shown that they were true internationalists.

The first year after the October Revolution, a year when class battles unfolded in Finland, Bulgaria, Austria-Hungary, Germany and other countries, witnessed the emergence of genuinely Marxist groups and their growth into the first Communist Parties. By the end of 1918 there were Communist Parties in Finland, Austria, Hungary, the Netherlands, Poland and Germany. A revolutionary internationalist stand was adopted by the workers and Social-Democratic Parties of Bulgaria, Sweden, Norway, Greece, the Kingdom of the Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, Mexico and Argentina. Communist groups and circles appeared in 1918-1919 also in other countries. The young communist movement, which had not yet acquired the experience of leading the masses, took shape rapidly. In March 1919 representatives of communist organisations in 21 countries gathered in Moscow to found the *Third Communist International*.

At this new stage of the world revolutionary movement Lenin stressed that the ideological and political defeat of social-reformism was a key condition for the international unity of the working class and preparing it for the socialist revolution. In line with this, the task was set of securing the ideological and organisational rupture of the revolutionary workers with social-chauvinism and centrism, with the ideology and practices of Right-wing Social-Democracy. "Unity with the social-chauvinists is betrayal of the revolution, betrayal of the proletariat, betrayal of socialism, desertion to the bourgeoisie," Lenin wrote, "because it is 'unity' with the *national bourgeoisie* of 'one's own' country *against*

* For details of the struggle between revolutionary and reformist trends in the international working-class movement on the eve of the establishment of the Comintern and for information on Lenin's work in uniting the revolutionary forces during the First World War see Y. G. Tyomkin, *Lenin and the International Social-Democratic Movement, 1914-1917*, Russ. ed., Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1968; N. Y. Korozyov, *Lenin and the International Working-Class Movement, 1914-1918*, Russ. ed., Politizdat, Moscow, 1968; and also *The Communist International. A Short Survey*, prepared by the Institute of Marxism-Leninism at the CC CPSU, Russ. ed., Politizdat, Moscow, 1969.

the unity of the international revolutionary proletariat, is unity *with* the bourgeoisie *against* the proletariat.”* Lenin showed that the verbal acceptance of revolution by the Centrists was actually a screen for a thoroughly opportunist, reformist, nationalistic, petty-bourgeois policy. He said that this was “the chief evil of the Second International”** and that at the given moment it was the greatest danger to the working-class movement in the West.

During the sharp revolutionary crisis that shook the capitalist world after the victory of the Great October Revolution, the working-class movement split into revolutionary and reformist trends over the question of whether or not the proletariat should fight for the establishment of its dictatorship. For that reason the central place in the work of the First Congress of the Comintern was occupied by Lenin’s theses and report on bourgeois democracy and the dictatorship of the proletariat. At the Congress Lenin said that the Communists had to understand clearly that the socialist revolution was necessary, as was the replacement of the bourgeois state by a state of a new type, by the dictatorship of the working class. He underscored the decisive importance of the proletariat’s leadership of the struggle for socialism. “The experience of all revolutions and all movements of the exploited classes, the experience of the world socialist movement teaches us that only the proletariat is in a position to unite and lead the scattered and backward sections of the working and exploited population.”***

The First Comintern Congress laid the ideological and organisational foundation for the unity of the proletarians of all countries under the slogan of the dictatorship of the proletariat. It charted the basic principles of the political strategy of the Communist Parties, and made the Leninist teaching of imperialism, the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat, and of the proletariat’s alliance with the working peasants and the national liberation movement the property of the entire world communist movement. Incontestably, this was a service to history by Lenin. “Lenin’s work,” Palmiro Togliatti subsequently recalled, “was of decisive importance in the formation of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 500.

** Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 357.

*** Ibid., Vol. 28, p. 466.

the Communist International and in giving its very first actions a principled foundation by restoring the truths of Marxism and enlarging on the Marxist teaching.”*

The revolutionary movement that started in Western Europe soon after the Comintern was founded confirmed Lenin's analysis of the world socio-political struggle made at the First Comintern Congress. In a situation witnessing a popular shift to the Left and a heroic struggle by national contingents of the proletariat, Soviet republics sprang up in Hungary (March 21-August 1, 1919), Bavaria (April 13-May 1, 1919) and Slovakia (June 16-July 5, 1919). There were powerful strike movements in France, Britain, the USA and Japan.

The class battles of the working people were accompanied by a swift growth of the world communist movement. A steadily increasing number of revolutionary Marxist groups evolved into Communist Parties and joined the Communist International. Revolutionary contingents of the international youth, women's and trade union movements rallied under the banner of Lenin. The Communist Youth International was founded in November 1919 under the direct leadership of the Comintern. Moreover, the Comintern began setting up international revolutionary women's and trade union organisations.

Not all of the gains made by the revolutionary masses in the interval between the first and second congresses were consolidated. The Soviet republics in Hungary, Bavaria and Slovakia succumbed to the onslaught of imperialist and local reaction. To a large extent this was due to the treachery of the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic Parties.

In these class battles grave miscalculations were made also by revolutionary groups and parties, which had not completely mastered the Leninist views on the role played by the Party of the working class in preparing for and accomplishing the revolution, on the allies of the proletariat, and so on. The Leftist and sectarian errors of the newly formed revolutionary Communist groups and Parties also made themselves felt.

The Second Congress of the Comintern was convened in July-August 1920 to study the experience of the revolu-

* P. Togliatti, *Problemi del movimento operaio internazionale 1956-1961*, Rome, 1962, p. 299.

tionary struggle and draw lessons from it. The proceedings were held under Lenin's direct guidance. The Congress adopted the terms for membership of the Comintern known as the "21 conditions". This document briefly characterised the ideological, tactical and organisational principles of the proletarian Parties of the new type. By adopting the "21 conditions", the Comintern closed its doors to wavering and opportunist elements and to expounders of reformist and opportunist views, thereby helping to unite the Communist Parties.

Lenin always insisted on Communists acting in a revolutionary manner. He stressed that "recognition of the dictatorship of the proletariat means making a determined, relentless, and, what is most important, a fully conscious and consistent break with the opportunism, reformism, equivocation and evasiveness of the Second International—a break with the leaders who *cannot help* carrying on the old tradition, with the old (not in age, but in methods) parliamentarians, trade union and co-operative society officials, etc.

"To break with them is essential. To pity them would be criminal; it would mean betraying the fundamental interests of tens of millions of workers and small peasants for the paltry interests of some ten thousand or hundred thousand people."**

While noting that it was necessary to make a clean break with opportunism, the great leader of the proletariat oriented the Communists on a determined struggle against adventurism, which is accompanied by clamorous revolutionary verbiage. In "*Left-Wing*" *Communism—an Infantile Disorder*, which was translated into three languages and handed to the delegates to the Second Congress, he showed the danger and political harm of sectarianism, scientifically substantiated the correct strategy and tactics of the Communist Parties aimed at winning the masses, and securing "the universal and thorough awareness of all Communists in all countries, of the necessity to display the utmost *flexibility* in their tactics".**

Another reason that these injunctions were of immense importance at the time was that the Communist International was founded in a period when the Social-Democratic Parties

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 358.

** Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 102.

enjoyed considerable influence in the working-class movement of many capitalist countries. They had the support of the overwhelming majority of organised workers. This was due to the fact that reformism had a broad social mainstay in the "working-class aristocracy", due to the skilful social manoeuvring of the bourgeoisie which inspired faith in reformist policy among a section of the proletariat, the direct assistance rendered to the reformist leaders by the bourgeoisie, the long-standing traditions of the Social-Democratic movement and the defeat of the revolutionary actions of the proletariat in some European countries.

The Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic movement deftly utilised in their own interests the social and democratic gains which the people had secured during the postwar revolutionary upsurge. Preaching that a period had set in during which "capitalism was growing into socialism", they declared that the road to socialism lay directly through parliamentary democracy, through victory at parliamentary elections, for which revolutionary action by the masses was not at all necessary. In order to preserve and strengthen their position and prevent the spread of communist influence among the masses, they baited and persecuted revolutionary-minded workers, expelling them from the trade unions, splitting trade union associations and so on. They did not shrink from direct co-operation with the bourgeoisie and the state apparatus against the revolutionary movement.

Centrism was the obstacle to the ideological and organisational unity of many Left-wing elements round the Communist International. While acknowledging that revolutionary reforms and even the dictatorship of the proletariat were correct and necessary and calling for the unity of the working-class movement, the centrist leaders, in fact, sought to maintain their influence over the masses and prevent them from going over to the Communists.

In February 1921 the centrist parties founded the Workers' International Union of Socialist Parties, the so-called Two-and-a-Half International, in Vienna. In 1923 this association merged with the Second International to form the Labour and Socialist International.

In this difficult situation the Leninist Communist International headed the struggle to consolidate the revolutionary proletarian movement and set up and strengthen Communist

Parties. At the close of 1920 and beginning of 1921 Communist Parties were formed in almost all the European countries and in some countries in America, Asia and Africa. Although some Communist Parties (for example, in Germany and France) had the support of considerable sections of the workers, they were numerically small, however, and had under their influence only a small segment of the proletariat in the capitalist world. At the beginning of 1921, according to incomplete figures, their membership, excluding that of the Russian Communist Party (Bolsheviks), totalled approximately 760,000.* The fact that most of the Communist Parties were numerically small and inexperienced seriously hindered the spread of their influence among the people.

Towards the end of 1920 and beginning of 1921 the revolutionary wave began to recede in the capitalist countries. The movement for the seizure of factories in Italy ended in failure. In Czechoslovakia the December general strike was defeated. In March 1921 with the complicity of the Right Social-Democrats, the German reactionaries provoked and brutally suppressed a proletarian uprising in Central Germany. The world economic crisis of 1920-21 was used by the bourgeoisie for an offensive against the working class: exploitation was intensified and the post-war gains of the working people were completely or partially nullified. A sinister force, fascism, appeared on the political scene in some countries.

The new situation springing from the capitalist offensive on the economic and political interests of the working class as a whole brought to the fore the need to defend the day-to-day economic and political demands of the working people and the gains won by them during the revolutionary upsurge. In the course of this struggle it became possible to unite broad sections of the people round concrete demands, unite various working-class organisations and thereby enlarge the united front of the proletarian class struggle. The problem of a united front, closely linked with the relationship between different contingents of the working-class movement, primarily between the Communists and the Social-Democrats, was complicated by fundamental diver-

* For the sake of comparison, it may be pointed out that in 1921 the Social-Democratic and Socialist Parties had nearly 8 million members, while the reformist-controlled Amsterdam (Trade Union) International had roughly 22 million members.

gences in the approach of the Communists and Social-Democrats to basic issues of the class struggle. However, the assault of the capitalists and reactionaries could only be countered by a united working-class front, which was the key guarantee of a successful struggle of the working people for their interests.

The initiative in creating a united working-class front was taken by the Communist International and its various sections. On January 7, 1921, in an Open Letter to the Social-Democratic and Independent Social-Democratic Parties, and also to the Communist Workers' Party of Germany and the trade unions, the Central Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany proposed launching a joint struggle to secure the satisfaction of the people's day-to-day economic needs and defend democratic rights and freedoms. "The German Communists took Lenin's injunctions into consideration and acted on the principle that the working class cannot achieve the dictatorship of the proletariat in a single leap, that the Communist Party has to establish close links with the masses and prepare for a long struggle for power," Walter Ulbricht said at a scientific session dedicated to the 50th anniversary of the Comintern.*

In the international communist movement there was a wide response to this Open Letter. In assessing this step by the UCPG some Communist Parties showed a certain immaturity and inexperience. They did not understand that the new situation demanded a reconsideration of the methods used in the class struggle. The policy of supporting "their own" bourgeoisie pursued by the Social-Democratic leadership during the world war and its opposition to the revolutionary movement earned for the reformists the hatred and contempt of advanced workers. Also lying heavily on the scales was the mood linked with the conditions of struggle in the preceding period. A variety of petty-bourgeois revolutionism became widespread in some Parties. The "Left" elements closed their eyes to the fact that the revolutionary wave was ebbing and that the masses were not prepared for new actions. They believed that victory could be won through the actions of a militant minority of the working class. As a result, the revolutionary vanguard faced the threat of failure in the event it took action prematurely.

* *Pravda*, March 27, 1969.

This sectarian theory and the practice stemming from it thus became the main danger within the communist movement.

Headed by Lenin, the Communist International took determined action against "Left" sentiments, patiently explaining why they were wrong and extremely dangerous to the proletariat. Lenin clearly formulated the tasks of the communist movement at that stage. These were to overcome inexperience and the inability to work among the people, to renounce some forms and methods of activity that did not conform to the new situation, to teach and train the young Communist Parties so that they could really fulfil their vanguard role, and unite them in the common struggle for the implementation of the immediate tasks of the working-class movement. "We have an army of Communists all over the world," Lenin wrote. "It is still poorly trained and poorly organised. It would be extremely harmful to forget this truth or be afraid of admitting it. Submitting ourselves to a most careful and rigorous test, and studying the experience of our own movement, we must train this army efficiently; we must organise it properly, and test it in all sorts of manoeuvres, all sorts of battles, in attack and in retreat. We cannot win without this long and hard schooling."^{*}

Lenin gave the utmost attention to training the Communist Parties, closely following the development of the revolutionary struggle and the situation in the Communist Parties and helping them to get their bearings in the difficult situation, work out correct policy and strengthen their ranks.

At the close of February 1921 he had a meeting with Georgi Dimitrov, who was sent to Moscow by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Bulgaria. Dimitrov informed Lenin that the leadership of the Bulgarian Communists believed that the conditions for an armed uprising had matured in Bulgaria. Lenin said that this view was fundamentally wrong. The Communist Party, he pointed out, was still weak, while the Farmers' Union, in which Socialist-Revolutionary trends and elements were predominant, still enjoyed considerable influence over the people. The international situation was particularly unfavourable,

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 520.

thus ruling out any support from without for the revolution in Bulgaria. Lenin, S. Blagoyeva wrote, told Dimitrov: "My advice to you is don't let yourself be carried away.... You'll be crushed. The reactionary forces are still strong, while you're still quite unprepared."* His counsel to the Bulgarian Communists was: "Concentrate on strengthening the Communist Party as the vanguard of the working class and seriously take up the organisation of the working class itself, especially as it is still relatively weak numerically and qualitatively (you still have hardly any hereditary workers). At the same time build up the alliance of the workers with the peasants (chiefly with the poor and middle peasants). Promote the influence of communist ideas in the Army (chiefly among the soldiers)... Do not let yourselves be carried away by enthusiasm. Act soberly and prepare tirelessly to ensure the victory of the revolution also in your country."**

A factor complicating the struggle against sectarian, doctrinaire sentiments was that in the leadership of the Comintern itself these sentiments were repeatedly propounded by Zinoviev and Bukharin. At a meeting of the Comintern Executive on February 22, 1921, when the tactics of the United Communist Party of Germany were discussed, Zinoviev and Bukharin attacked the UCPG leadership for the Open Letter. Zinoviev asserted that it was not possible to reach agreement with other workers' parties. Bukharin assessed the letter as a "non-revolutionary act" and accused the UCPG of abandoning the real struggle. Zinoviev and Bukharin thereby questioned the very foundations of the policy pursued by the Communist Parties in the period when the tide of revolution was ebbing and sought to push them to the road of dangerous sectarianism and isolation from the people.

Lenin spoke sharply against these views and warmly supported the initiative of the UCPG. He wrote to Clara Zetkin and Paul Levi: "The only thing I have seen is the Open Letter, which I think is *perfectly correct* tactics (I have condemned the contrary opinion of our 'Lefts' who were opposed to this letter).*** Somewhat later, on the eve of the

* *Reminiscences of Lenin by Bulgarian Communists*, Russ. ed., Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1958, pp. 52-53.

** *Pravda*, November 12, 1966.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 124

Third Congress of the Comintern, he insisted that the draft theses on tactics should indicate the need for Open Letter tactics. He wrote: "...the tactic of the Open Letter should definitely be applied everywhere. This should be said straight out, clear and exactly, because waverings in regard to the Open Letter are extremely harmful, extremely, extremely shameful and **extremely widespread**. We may as well admit this. All those who failed to grasp the necessity of the Open Letter tactic should be *expelled* from the Communist International within a month after its Third Congress."*

In opposition to Lenin's policy of uniting the workers in the course of the struggle for day-to-day economic interests, in the struggle to uphold and extend democratic rights, the "Lefts" advanced the so-called offensive theory, which required the Communist Parties to lead the masses in an armed offensive regardless of the objective conditions. They ignored the ebb-tide of revolutionary activity, the mood of the people and their unpreparedness for decisive action. Due to its seemingly revolutionary character and the hot-headedness and inexperience of many young Communists the "offensive theory" became quite fashionable in the Communist Parties of Germany, Hungary, Italy and Austria and among a section of the French, Polish and Czechoslovak Communists.

However, the very first attempt to apply this theory in practice strikingly showed the danger that it harboured for the revolutionary movement. As we have already mentioned, in March 1921 the German counter-revolution, aided and abetted by the Right Social-Democrats, provoked the workers to start an armed uprising in a number of regions in Central Germany. Pressured by the "Lefts" in the leadership, the Central Committee of the United Communist Party of Germany assessed the March events as the beginning of a revolutionary offensive and called upon the workers to stage a general solidarity strike and start an active struggle to overthrow the bourgeois government. However, the UCPG and the working class were not ready for an armed uprising throughout the country with the result that the workers of Central Germany suffered an overwhelming defeat. Actually, the adventurist policy of the "Lefts", founded on the

* Ibid., Vol. 42, p. 321.

"offensive theory", helped the German reactionaries to carry out their counter-revolutionary plans, undermined the Party's influence in the working class and threatened to isolate it from the masses. Highly appraising the heroism of the revolutionary workers, Lenin wrote at the time that "however heroic it was, *in future* such a challenge, provoked by the government, which, since I. 1919, has already killed by provocations 20,000 workers *should not* be accepted until the Communists have the majority behind them all over the country, and not just in one small district".*

The March events were heatedly debated in the UCPG and some other Parties. Clara Zetkin sharply criticised the erroneous line of the "Left" leadership of the UCPG and the "offensive theory" itself. On April 14, 1921 she wrote to Lenin: "I consider that the CC has adopted an absolutely misguided attitude towards the action and towards the way of carrying it out. Those who have agitated as much as I among the masses cannot mistake their mood. The Party's Open Letter and, particularly, its demand for an alliance with Soviet Russia and for the immediate resumption of economic and political relations with her were not only necessary but possible and had a chance of success. Both these demands were everywhere hailed enthusiastically and they mobilised the masses standing far apart from the UCPG. The propagation of these slogans splendidly prepared the transition from propaganda to action. Its starting-points and bastions lay in the economic situation of individual regions. From the very beginning such a policy would by its very essence have turned into a determined struggle against the government. Action under the slogan of overthrowing the government would have been a blank shot from the outset. To say nothing of the fact that such an action would have been purely negative, for at the given moment there was no response to it from the masses."

The March events taught the Communist Parties much, showing them the extreme danger of Left-sectarian, adventurist trends. In the communist movement the more experienced militants saw this danger and fought it with determination. At the Inaugurating Congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in May 1921 Bohumir Šmeral spoke of the experience of Czechoslovak Communists

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 323.

who succeeded in winning the support of a considerable section of the old Social-Democratic Party and set up a large Communist Party, and warned against the danger of adventurism. His report was later read by Lenin. The following is an excerpt with markings by Lenin.

"I should like to give you an opinion based on our own experience. First, to avoid misunderstanding or arbitrary interpretations, I must define my understanding of the word 'adventure'. It goes without saying that while we do not find it possible to begin action for the seizure of power until the corresponding international situation has matured, as I have already mentioned, and while for the immediate future we attach paramount importance to propaganda and organisational work we take into account the active movements of the masses, strikes, demonstrations and even mutinies called forth by food shortages, protest demonstrations against specific acts of violence, against reaction and so on. In all these cases we must not betray the masses; on the contrary, we must be always with them. Probably, we shall ourselves organise large-scale actions of the masses in support of concrete demands regardless of whether these demands emanate from parliamentary or trade union activity or from general conditions. In none of these cases can one speak of an 'adventure' even if the action is of a most determined nature. I take 'adventure' to mean action not stemming automatically and naturally from the local situation or from the own requirements of the masses. I call an 'adventure' actions whose organisers believe they can artificially create a favourable situation, that these actions must take place precisely when this is desired by impatient individuals, even against the will of the masses, even if it entails drawing the masses by means of provocation. No action taken by the masses under pressure of real conditions nor any development of the class struggle caused by these conditions is an 'adventure'. Far from desiring to hold up or extinguish such actions, we want to and shall support them by political means. An 'adventure' is neither the first sortie from the trenches when the situation is ripe for an open decisive battle with the purpose of seizing power.

"An 'adventure' is the desire artificially to call forth a battle situation regardless of conditions, regardless of the price, in accordance with the ideological views of individuals or a small group of people, even if it means having recourse to provocation. We must protest most strongly against tactics of this kind. This must be stated by our Congress, because some comrades have expressed the view that the workers must be compelled to fight at the price of certain defeat, that the movement will become sufficiently strong only through heavy sacrifice, that defeat will fortify in the proletariat the striving to struggle. True, under certain conditions the movement can benefit even by defeat—it broadens, gains strength, crystallises and wins the trust of more strata of the people. This happens when to every worker it is clear that we have been compelled to fight by the bourgeoisie or by betrayal, even if the enemy is stronger, when it is obvious to the workers that we had no right to evade battle because in the given case it was a matter of inevitable defence and of our class honour. . . . After the experience of two and a half years which we have acquired thanks to careful observation and a study of the situation in our country and in the whole of Central Europe, I can say openly that the tactic of 'adventure', in the same way as the tactic of individual acts of terrorism, cannot be accepted as a normal means of struggle in the working-class movement.

"A prerequisite for revolutionary development is that huge masses of proletarians and semi-proletarians must be set in motion and brought to a boiling point. . . .

"Some people are surprised and disappointed by the slow development of the social revolution and cease to believe in it.

"Actually, if we abstract ourselves from subjective desires, all this will seem quite natural to us. An historical process that fundamentally changes the entire social structure cannot be a matter of a short period of one or two years."

The "Left" elements, on the contrary, gave their wholehearted approval to the policy of the CC UCPG during the March events and urged its adoption everywhere. They

labelled as opportunistic those Communists who offered sound arguments against the "offensive theory" and pinpointed the errors made by the CC UCPG.

A determined rebuff to Left-sectarian sentiments was given during the preparations for the Third Congress of the Comintern and then at the Congress itself, which generalised the experience gained in the class battles of the initial post-war years and made a considerable contribution towards charting a new policy line of ensuring a close link between the vanguard and the worker masses and uniting the proletariat in the struggle against the capitalist offensive.

Béla Kun and August Thalheimer, member of the CC UCPG, who were active supporters of the "offensive theory" at the time, prepared for the Third Congress their own draft theses on tactics. This document, which contains no criticism whatever of the March errors of the UCPG leaders, stated that the counter-revolutionary front had been breached in Germany and therefore every effort should be made to intensify offensive action. There was an abundance of Left-sectarian ideas also in the theses on tactics drafted by Radek on behalf of the Small Bureau of the Comintern Executive Committee.

Lenin closely scrutinised and sharply criticised both drafts for their incorrect assessment of the tasks and prospects of the revolutionary movement. "Thalheimer's and Béla Kun's theses," he wrote, "are politically utterly fallacious. Mere phrases and playing at Leftism."^{*} In the Radek draft the thesis that the Communist Party should win the majority of the working class was replaced by the thesis that it had to win the socially decisive section of the working class. Lenin called this the "height of absurdity". "To win power," he wrote, "you need, *under certain conditions* (even when the majority of the working class have already been won over to the principles of communism), a blow dealt at the decisive place by the majority of the socially decisive sections of the working class."^{**}

He warned that if Radek and Zinoviev, who supported the latter, insisted on their theses there would be "an open fight at the Congress". He insisted on a reconsideration of the initial draft theses to remove all Leftist ideas and clearly, exactly and unambiguously state the following central idea:

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 319.

^{**} *Ibid.*, p. 320.

"None of the Communist Parties anywhere have yet won the majority (of the working class), not only with regard to organisational leadership, but the principles of communism as well. This is the basis of everything. To 'weaken' this foundation of the only reasonable tactic is *criminal irresponsibility*.

"Hence: revolutionary explosions are possible nevertheless very soon considering the abundance of inflammable material in Europe; an easy victory of the working class—in exceptional cases—is also possible. But it would be absurd now to base the tactics of the Communist International on this possibility; it is absurd and harmful to write and think that the propaganda period has ended and the period of action has started.

"The tactics of the Communist International should be based on a steady and systematic drive to win the *majority of the working class*, first and foremost *within the old trade unions*. Then we shall win for certain, whatever the course of events. As for 'winning' for a short time in an exceptionally happy turn of events—any fool can do that.

"Hence: the tactic of the Open Letter should definitely be applied everywhere."*

The proletariat's brilliant leader held that in the theses it was necessary to explain the errors committed by the UCPG during the March events so that on this example the Communist Parties would see that no offensive action should be started when the objective conditions had not matured for such action. His recommendations were embodied in the draft theses on tactics submitted to the Comintern Congress by the RCP(B) delegation.

Lenin's aim was that the entire proceedings at the Congress and its decisions should be permeated with the understanding that for Communists the central task was to work among the masses, to unite the revolutionary vanguard with the broadest masses, and to educate them on their own experience of struggle against capitalism and reaction. In his remarks on the draft theses on the organisational make-up of the Communist Parties and on the methods and content of their work, drawn up by Otto Kuusinen, Lenin wrote:

"It should be stated at greater length that this is exactly what is lacking in most of the legal parties of the West.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, pp. 320-21.

There is no *everyday* work (revolutionary work) by *every* member of the Party.

"This is the chief drawback.

"To change this is the most difficult job of all.

"*But this is the most important*".*

Further, he suggested dealing in detail with the duty of Communists to work "*among the mass* of the unorganised proletariat and of the proletariat organised in the yellow trade unions (including the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals) *and the non-proletarian* sections of the *working people*".**

Clara Zetkin recalls that in a conversation shortly before the Congress opened Lenin said to her: "The first wave of the world revolution has subsided, and the second has not yet risen. It would be dangerous if we harboured illusions on this score. We are not King Xerxes who ordered the sea to be beaten with chains. But does the statement of facts mean to remain idle, i.e., to abandon the struggle? By no means. We must study, study and study! We must act, act and act! We must prepare. We must be well prepared in order consciously and energetically to utilise the next coming revolutionary wave. That is the heart of the problem. We need tireless Party agitation and propaganda and then Party action. But this Party action must be free of the mad idea that it can replace action by the masses. We Bolsheviks had to work hard among the masses before we could say to ourselves: 'Everything's ready, forward!' For that reason go to the masses! To win the masses is a prerequisite for the conquest of power."***

The Third Congress of the Comintern opened in Moscow on June 22, 1921. Lenin's report on the tactics of the RCP(B) and the theses drafted by him played the key role in charting the political line of the international communist movement. Showing the world revolution as a single process of the interaction of three forces (the country of the victorious proletariat, the working-class movement of the capitalist countries and the national liberation movement), Lenin clearly defined the place of each of these elements in the revolutionary struggle. Describing the plan for building the

* Ibid., p. 317.

** Ibid., p. 318.

*** *On Lenin. Reminiscences of Foreign Contemporaries*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1966, p. 37.

economic basis of socialism in Soviet Russia and showing the need for the New Economic Policy, he underscored the international significance of the experience of building socialism and of the experience gained by the Party in heading the first victorious proletarian revolution. "The experiment we are making," he said, "will be useful for future proletarian revolutions, and they will be able to make better technical preparations for solving it."**

The Congress unanimously approved the Leninist policy of the RCP(B), calling Soviet Russia "the first and most important citadel of the world revolution";** and declaring that "*unconditional support of Soviet Russia* is still the main duty of the Communists of all countries".***

At the Congress the political line was framed in struggle against those who did not appreciate the importance of the work of Communists among the masses and of the struggle to defend the day-to-day interests of the people. Many of the delegates wanted a decision in the spirit of the "offensive theory". The "Left" elements insisted on an intensification of the struggle against "Centrist and semi-Centrist elements" in the Communist Parties, classifying among them those who advocated flexible tactics.

At the Congress there was a small group of "ultra-Lefts" (delegates from the Communist Workers' Party of Germany and Dutch "Lefts") who came out with extreme sectarian and adventurist views. The "ultra-Lefts" from the CWPG attacked the Comintern on all issues in an effort to force it to adopt their anarcho-syndicalist ideas.

On July 1 the delegations of three Parties—German, Austrian and Italian—published their amendments to the draft theses on tactics. These amendments were drawn up in the spirit of the "offensive theory". They suggested deleting from the theses the word "*majority*" where it was stated that it was necessary to win the *majority of the working class* to the principles of communism. Furthermore, among other things, they insisted on dropping the positive assessment of the UCPG's Open Letter. In concentrated form these amendments expressed the "Leftist" sentiments of those Communists who hoped for an "easier"

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 485.

** *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1933, p. 231.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 199.

way to the socialist revolution (with the help of the minority of the working class).

Lenin spoke in reply to the authors of these amendments. "An absolute majority," he said, "is not always essential; but what is essential to win and retain power is not only the majority of the working class—I use the term 'working class' in its West European sense, i.e., in the sense of the industrial proletariat—but also the majority of the working and exploited rural population."* In the "Left" amendments Lenin perspicaciously saw a grave danger threatening to isolate the Communist Parties from the masses. He said: "... if these amendments denote a definite trend, a relentless fight against this trend is essential, for otherwise there is no communism and no Communist International."** At a meeting of the Comintern Executive on June 17, 1921, a few days before the Congress, Lenin warned that there was only one way to hinder the victory of communism in France, Britain and Germany—and that was to follow the Leftist road. The amendments to the theses were an expression of precisely such "Leftist" stupidities, and, Lenin pointed out, "if the Congress is not going to wage a vigorous offensive against such errors, against such 'Leftist' stupidities, the whole movement is doomed".***

Speaking of the importance of united front tactics, he called the Open Letter of the UCPG a "model political step. It is a model because it is the first act of a practical method of winning over the majority of the working class".**** In a letter to German Communists after the Congress he explained that the winning over of the majority should not be understood formally. "When in Rome, in July 1921, the entire proletariat—the reformist proletariat of the trade unions and the Centrists of Serrati's party—followed the Communists against the fascists, that was *winning over the majority of the working class to our side.*

"This was far from winning them decisively. It was doing so only partially, only momentarily, only locally. But it was winning over the majority."***** Further, he wrote that this could be achieved even when the majority of the prole-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 476.

** Ibid., p. 469.

*** Ibid., p. 468.

**** Ibid., p. 470.

***** Ibid., p. 522.

tariat formally followed bourgeois leaders or leaders of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, or when the majority of the proletariat wavered. He did not make the rupture of the rank-and-file of the reformist parties and trade unions with their organisations a condition of the struggle for a united front. *The main thing was to draw the masses into the common struggle, in the course of which their own experience would show them that the policy of the Communists was correct and they would side with them.*

Explaining that the tactics of the Communists had to be flexible and cautious, Lenin warned at the same time that this should not mean renunciation of the revolutionary struggle, and that opportunists and reformists should not be tolerated in the Party. "The mark of true communism," he wrote, "is a break with opportunism. We shall be quite frank and open with those Communists who subscribe to this and, boldly, in the conviction that we are right, will tell them: 'Don't do anything stupid; be clever and skilful.' But we shall speak in this way only with Communists who have broken with the opportunists."^{*}

Lenin had the wholehearted support of Clara Zetkin, Robert Minor (Ballister), Paul Vaillant-Couturier, Thomas Bell and many other delegates to the Congress, who stated their approval of the theses submitted by the RCP(B) delegation. They declared that these theses, which summed up the experience and state of the international communist movement, conformed to the interests of the further development of the class struggle of the proletariat and correctly outlined the further work of the Communist Parties. The initiators of the "Leftist" amendments wrote a letter to the Congress Presidium to inform it that they had withdrawn the amendments and agreed with the basic principles of the theses on tactics permeated with Lenin's ideas. The theses were unanimously approved by the Congress.

In these theses, entitled *The World Situation and Our Tasks*, it was stated that the revolutionary movement which had gripped the capitalist world since 1917 had not overthrown either world or European capitalism, while in the period between the Second and Third Congresses many of the battles of the working class had ended in partial defeat. "The first postwar period of the revolutionary movement,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 464.

characterised by spontaneous pressure, largely shapeless methods and aims and extraordinary panic of the ruling classes," the theses stated, "seems in the main to have ended. The class self-confidence of the bourgeoisie and the outward stability of its state institutions have unquestionably grown stronger. If the panicky attitude to communism has not passed, it has at any rate weakened. The leaders of the bourgeoisie even boast of the might of their state apparatus and in all countries have gone over to the offensive against the worker masses on both the economic and the political front."*

On the basis of its analysis of the situation, the alignment of class forces in the world and the state of the revolutionary movement, the Congress formulated the principal task of the Communist Parties as follows: "lead, extend and deepen the present defensive struggle of the proletariat, give it unity and, in accordance with developments, raise it to the level of a *political final struggle*."** Thereby the Congress defined the political line of the communist movement aimed at uniting the masses in the course of the struggle against capitalism, strengthening the links of the Communists with the masses and winning the majority of the proletariat, the majority of the working and exploited people to communism. "In view of the fact that in Western Europe and America the workers are organised in trade unions and political parties, and hence, only in very rare cases is it possible to count on a spontaneous movement," the theses on tactics stated, "the Communist Parties must, by consolidating their influence in the trade unions and increasing their pressure on other parties relying on the proletariat, begin a joint struggle for the immediate interests of the proletariat."***

Warning against a Leftist underestimation of the significance of the struggle for the day-to-day interests of the working people, the Congress pointed out that "every accusation of reformism with regard to a partial struggle is the consequence of inability to grasp the vital issues of revolutionary action".****

Summing up the importance of defending the day-to-day

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 166.

** Ibid., p. 179.

*** Ibid., p. 193.

**** Ibid, p. 191.

interests of the working people, the Comintern Executive wrote in an appeal to the workers of all countries, published after the Congress: "It is only in struggle for elementary vital demands of the worker masses that we can build up a united front of the proletariat against the bourgeoisie, and put an end to the split in the proletariat which facilitates the further existence of the bourgeoisie.... *Be the vanguard of the worker masses who are coming into motion; be their heart and brain.... To be the vanguard means: to march at the head of the masses as their most astute and cautious section.* It is only by becoming such a vanguard that the Communist Parties will be able not only to create a united proletarian front but lead it to victory over the enemy."^{*}

While orienting the Communist Parties on united action by the proletariat, the Congress drew the attention of the Comintern national sections to the need for winning the support of the peasant masses, the urban petty bourgeoisie and broad sections of the so-called middle estate—white-collar workers and intellectuals—through democratic action.

Drawn up under Lenin's guidance, the Third Congress decisions on questions of tactics underlay the resolution adopted by it on the tasks of the Communists in trade unions and co-operative associations and on the methods and forms of work among women and young people. The First International Congress of Revolutionary Trade Unions and Producers' Associations, held in Moscow in July of the same year, proclaimed the formation of the Red International of Labour Unions (Profintern), which launched an energetic drive to restore the unity of the trade union movement on the basis of the principles underlying the class struggle of the proletariat.

All the decisions passed by the Third Congress were permeated with Lenin's view that the Communists had to become the vanguard of the working class. "In order to achieve this," stated the Congress theses on the organisational make-up of the Communist Parties, "the Communists have to take part in *all the simplest clashes and movements of the working class and uphold* the cause of the workers in all the conflicts between them and the capitalists over

^{*} *Theses and Resolutions of the Third Comintern Congress*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1921, pp. 93-94.

working hours, wages, working conditions and so on. In addition, the Communists have to make a close study of the specific problems of the life of workers, help the workers understand these problems, draw their attention to the most flagrant abuses, help them to formulate their demands exactly and practically, try to promote a feeling of solidarity among them, and make them realise that they have common interests and a common cause with all the workers of the given country as a single working class forming part of the world-wide army of the proletariat.”*

Proceeding from the postulate that unity of the revolutionary vanguard is a prerequisite and an indispensable condition for the unity of the working class and for joint action by it, the Congress stressed that the highest duty of every Communist was to ensure the unity of the Communist Parties on the Marxist-Leninist foundation. “Any weakening or *destruction of the common united front* is the worst *violation of discipline* and the worst mistake in the revolutionary *struggle*.”**

Thus, summing up the experience of the working-class struggle, the Comintern led by Lenin laid the beginning for a new stage in the history of the international communist movement, the stage of struggle for a united proletarian front. “You will now all return home and tell the workers that we have become more reasonable than we were before the Third Congress,” Lenin said at a conference of members of the German, Polish, Czechoslovak, Hungarian and Italian delegations to the Congress. “You should not be put out by this; you will say that we made mistakes and now wish to act more carefully; by doing so we shall win the masses over from the Social-Democratic and Independent Social-Democratic parties, masses, who, objectively, by the whole course of events, are being pushed towards us, but who are afraid of us. . . .

“Our sole strategy now is to become stronger, hence cleverer, more sensible, ‘more opportunistic’, and that is what we must tell the masses. But after we have won over the masses by our reasonableness, we shall use the tactic of offensive in the strictest sense of that word.”***

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 208.

** *Ibid.*, p. 222.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, pp. 324, 326.

The united front tactics charted in the decisions of the Third Comintern Congress had to be translated into reality, enriched with the practical experience of the struggle in different countries and concretised in accordance with the conditions obtaining in each individual country. Lenin and the Comintern Executive attached the utmost importance to this. "... There is a wave of unification," Lenin wrote on July 28, 1921, "of *all* workers (both SDP and USP-Leute)* in the struggle against Lohnabbau,** etc. Of course, Zetkin was *quite right* in saying that the Communists should *back* this unification *in the struggle against the capitalists*. If the "Lefts" should object, they should be made to see reason."*** In a letter of August 14, 1921 to the German Communists, he vigorously emphasised that all Communists had to take part in the struggle and day-to-day life of the masses.

After the Third Comintern Congress a steadily increasing number of working people joined the movement for united action. At meetings and rallies and in the press the workers demanded a united front of proletarian organisations. However, the objective aspiration of the proletarian masses to unite in face of the offensive launched by the common enemy was hindered by the deep split in the working class. Matters reached a point where the workers belonging to one of the proletarian organisations regarded the members of other associations not as class comrades with whom they had to march and fight shoulder to shoulder but as adversaries. In many countries the split was of relatively recent origin and the bitterness it fostered strongly affected the relations between Communists and Social-Democrats, creating enormous difficulties for the joint struggle.

This was utilised by the Right-reformist leaders, who argued that there could be no question of Social-Democrats co-operating with the Communists, who, they alleged, used the united front slogan only as a demagogic subterfuge. While declaring that they were prepared to negotiate and merge with the Two-and-a-Half International, the leaders of the Second International categorically rejected joint

* Rank-and-file of the Social-Democratic and Independent Social-Democratic Parties.—*Ed.*

** Wage decreases.—*Ed.*

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 45, p. 232.

action with the Communists. Outwardly, the leadership of the Two-and-a-Half International was more flexible, saying that there had to be talks between all the three Internationals, but in fact they too sought a united front on a reformist foundation. In its Appeal of August 1, 1921, the Comintern Executive criticised the Right-centrist leaders' juggling with words about unity and underlined that for the worker masses the slogan of unity was an "expression of a *healthy desire for effective unity of the proletariat*".* The Appeal called on the Communists to head this new movement.

In some documents of that period the proletarian united front slogan was interpreted solely as the unity of the workers round the Communist Parties. It was hardly explained that this slogan chiefly meant joint action by the masses and by the different proletarian organisations in the struggle for specific common aims. This simplified concept of the united front as a movement in which the Communists had immediately to play the leading role while the members of reformist organisations joining this movement had forthwith to break with their leaders and follow the Communists adversely affected the practical efforts of the Communists to organise united action by the workers. A mood reducing the united front tactics to work in the trade unions and rejecting the possibility of Communists co-operating with Social-Democrats prevailed in some Communist Parties. At the same time among the Communists who had not yet shed the burden of Social-Democratic views the united front slogan created the illusion that the fundamental differences between the Communists and Social-Democrats were disappearing and that for the sake of unity it was expedient to make concessions in basic issues inasmuch as the prospect of revolution was moving aside. The struggle against Right-opportunist deviations, against the danger of the united front tactics sliding into Social-Democratic positions was particularly important in these Parties, where the majority of the members were former Social-Democrats.

Thus, in working out and implementing the united front tactics the Comintern had to fight the sectarian rejection of these tactics and their opportunist misrepresentation.

* *The Executive Committee and Presidium of the Comintern EC from July 13, 1921 to February 1, 1922*, Russ. ed., Petrograd, 1922, p. 72.

The movement for a united workers' front unfolded also on an international scale. On July 30, 1921 the Comintern Executive called upon the world proletariat to help Soviet Russia fight the famine that followed on the heels of the economic dislocation caused by the Civil War and the foreign intervention. In a letter of July 31 to the Communist Parties it recommended convening conferences with the participation of all proletarian organisations, and urged all workers' organisations to set up general local and national committees. At the same time, it warned that co-operation with representatives of non-communist workers' organisations in joint committees should not signify the abandonment of communist agitation.

The campaign to help the famine-stricken areas got under way in 1921-22 in many countries. The Comintern endeavoured to channel this campaign into the united front movement and bring more and more working people round to the realisation of their common interests and the adoption of the idea of internationalism. The International Workers' Relief sprang up during the solidarity campaign but nothing came of the efforts to secure co-operation with the organisations of the Second, Two-and-a-Half and Amsterdam Internationals in famine relief.

Neither was united action achieved with other international organisations of the working people in the struggle against bourgeois terror. On October 19, 1921 the Comintern Executive and the Profintern Executive Bureau called upon the workers' organisations of all countries to take action against the reaction in Spain and Yugoslavia. "Workers' organisations of all trends," this appeal stated, "are interested in halting this unprecedented massacre directed against representatives of the working class. We appeal to the Amsterdam International and suggest that it consider and discuss jointly with us the methods and forms of organising international action by the proletariat."^{*}

On November 17 the Comintern Executive and the Profintern Executive Bureau again called on the Executive of the Amsterdam International to organise joint operations against reaction. However, these appeals were ignored.

^{*} *The Executive Committee and Presidium of the Comintern EC...*, p. 260.

The initiative of the Comintern Executive in starting a drive for united action by the international proletariat was actively supported by the Communist Parties, which, in the conditions obtaining in their own countries, were looking for ways of forming a united front.

At the close of October 1921 the Communist Party of Germany proposed a clear-cut programme of economic and democratic demands to the leadership of other Workers' Parties and trade unions. In November, pressured by the rank and file the leadership of the trade unions published the "10 Demands", which envisaged the defence of the people's economic interests. The Communist Party of Germany gave its active support to these demands. The importance of united action was explained to the people and the programmes and ways of uniting the masses were analysed.

The practical struggle for a united front posed the Communists with serious theoretical problems, while in Germany the Communists were also confronted by the practical problem of what attitude to adopt to the possibility of setting up a government consisting of Social-Democrats, and whether Communists should participate in such a government. With the help of the Comintern Executive the leadership of the Communist Party of Germany gave a clear answer to this question: the Communist Party would support such a government if it satisfied the demands of the masses, and, under certain conditions, was even prepared to enter it. In analysing the concrete ways of drawing the masses into the struggle for socialism through the satisfaction of democratic demands, the creation of a united proletarian front and the formation on this basis of a workers' government, the Communist Party of Germany made a substantial contribution towards the united workers' front tactics evolved by the Comintern.

In Czechoslovakia the campaign for a united front was started by the newspaper *Rovnost*, organ of the Brno Territorial Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia. On November 20, 1921 the newspaper published an appeal by the Brno Workers' Council urging the workers to unite, regardless of national and political differences, for a joint rebuff to the bourgeoisie under slogans calling for a struggle against the rising cost of living, the decreasing wages, and the dismissals, for social insurance, the

confiscation of the property of profiteers, socialisation and so on.

Many other Communist Parties joined actively in the drive to set up a united workers' front. The Comintern closely followed developments, helping the Communist Parties to find the correct way of uniting the working people and avoid various deviations from the jointly charted line. It summed up the experience of the first steps toward a united front and made every effort to bring this experience to the notice of all Parties. On December 1, 1921 the Political Bureau of the CC RCP(B) adopted a resolution, written by Lenin, approving "the line of joint action with the workers of the Second International proposed by a number of Communist Parties of the Communist International".* Draft theses on united front tactics were drawn up on the basis of this resolution. After reading this document Lenin proposed that it should show the experience of the Bolsheviks, who, without relaxing their struggle against reformism, had time and again reached agreement with the Mensheviks "not only because of the vicissitudes of the struggle but also under pressure from the rank and file, who demanded check tests through their own experience".** After Lenin's recommendations were included in it, the draft was submitted to the Comintern Executive, which approved it on December 18, 1921 as the theses *On a United Workers' Front and on the Attitude To Be Adopted Towards Workers Belonging to the Second, Two-and-a-Half and Amsterdam Internationals and Also Towards Workers Supporting Anarcho-Syndicalist Organisations*.

In this document the united front tactics and the principles, ways and methods of setting up such a united front were profoundly substantiated. Stressing that these tactics were valid for the entire stage of transition until the victory of the socialist revolution, the theses pointed to the need for concretising them depending on the conditions and situation in each country. The theses noted that the absolute independence of each Communist Party entering into one or another kind of agreement with the parties of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals in stating

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 367.

** Ibid., p. 368.

its views and criticising the adversaries of the Communists was the principal and mandatory condition for participation in a united front. "While supporting the slogan calling for the maximum unity of the workers' organisations in every *practical action against the capitalist front*, the Communists must not under any circumstances refuse to state their views which comprise a most consistent defence of the interests of the working class as a whole."* The Comintern Executive warned the Communist Parties against regarding the united front as an ideological agreement with reformism and against being dissolved in an unprincipled bloc with the parties of the Second International. Flexibility in promoting the united front had to be combined with the defence of the principles of revolutionary policy.

On January 1, 1922, in order to popularise the united front theses, the Comintern Executive and the Profintern Executive Bureau published an appeal under the title "United Proletarian Front", which underscored the task of "uniting all the forces of the international proletariat and establishing a united front for all parties relying on the proletariat, regardless of the differences existing between them, inasmuch as they desire to fight jointly for the immediate pressing needs of the proletariat".** The appeal expounded concrete slogans calling for a struggle against the wage decreases, unemployment, robbery of the German people by the Entente imperialists, for workers' control of production, in defence of Soviet Russia, and against the arms race and imperialist plans of starting another war.

In the letters sent to the Communist Parties directly after the above-mentioned documents were approved, the Comintern urged that these tactics be adopted and correctly applied by all of them. In its letter of January 10, 1922 to the Communist Party of Germany, the Comintern declared that the arguments about how the united front should be set up—from above, i.e., by agreements between parties, or from below, i.e., by intensifying the struggle of the masses—were "sheer doctrinairism". "Of course, without the masses from below, at the factories, uniting and jettisoning all differences, it would be impossible to

* *The Executive Committee and Presidium of the Comintern EC...*, p. 395.

** *Ibid.*, p. 408.

fashion the forces necessary to enable a workers' government formed even in a parliamentary way on the basis of agreement between leading organisations to last even three weeks. It is obvious, however, that this common workers' front will take shape much more easily if the leading organisations do not oppose it, if they cease sabotaging it. We must, if only for that reason, do everything in our power to give the Social-Democratic leaders no opportunity for maintaining that they were compelled to unite with Stinnes because it was not possible to form a Left coalition. The clearer and more resolutely we show the masses that despite all the crimes of Noske and people like him we are prepared to sit down at the conference table with the Social-Democrats, the easier will it be to remove all the obstacles they are planning to put in the way of the united proletarian front."²

In each country the united workers' front policy pursued by the Communists took into account the conditions, specifics and tasks of the working-class movement and was modified accordingly. For example, in the case of Great Britain, where the Labour Party had the support of the bulk of the proletariat and the Communist Party was numerically very small, the Comintern Executive pointed out that the Communist Party should join forces with the Labour Party. Lenin advised that at the elections the British Communists should agitate and vote for members of the Labour Party with the exception of those very few cases where voting for a Communist was certain not to give the victory to a bourgeois candidate. Lenin's suggestion was supported by the Comintern Executive, which on January 13, 1922 recommended that the Communist Party of Great Britain should give its backing to the Labour Party at the elections.

Lenin held that every revolutionary worker had to join heart and soul in the election campaigns. The Communists had to use the elections to move forward the cause of communism and, where possible, ensure the victory of a workers' government. All means had to be utilised to make the Communist standpoint known to as many workers as possible through simple slogans and house-to-house canvas-

* *The Executive Committee and Presidium of the Comintern EC.*., pp. 432-33.

sing. Lenin was anxious that the Party should participate in the elections with practical and simple slogans and that it should not make any mistakes by accentuating theoretical issues.*

By following Lenin's advice, the British Communists achieved some success at the parliamentary elections in the autumn of 1922—for the first time two Communists were elected to the British Parliament.

The preparations for a conference of three Internationals played a large role in working out the principles for a united front. In mid-January 1922 the Comintern's vigorous efforts to set up such a front and the desire of the masses for united action induced the leadership of the Two-and-a-Half International to suggest the convocation of an international conference to consider the economic situation in Europe and working-class action against the onslaught of reaction. Lenin outlined in principle the tactical line to be adopted by the Comintern delegation at a conference with representatives of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals, and stipulated that equality was the principal condition for talks. He warned that if the Second or Two-and-a-Half Internationals raised "moot questions of policy such as our attitude to the Mensheviks, the question of Georgia, etc.", the delegation of the Comintern Executive would accept this provided the discussion covered the renegade attitude of the leaders of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals towards the Basle Manifesto, their complicity with the bourgeoisie in suppressing the revolutionary working-class and national liberation movements, and so on.** He insisted on the Comintern Executive delegation making the maximum use of the talks to uphold the policy of the Communists and show the masses that it was based on sound reasoning. "We must find occasion to declare officially that we regard the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals only as inconsistent and vacillating participants of a bloc with the counter-revolutionary world bourgeoisie, and that we agree to attend a meeting on the united front for the sake of achieving possible practical unity of direct action on the part of the masses and in order

* *The Communist Daily*, No. 1, November 13, 1922.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 393.

to expose the political error of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals' entire position."*

United front tactics and participation in an international conference of workers' organisations were examined at an extended plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive (February 21-March 4, 1922). Some of the delegations (Italian, Spanish and most of the French) spoke against the united front tactics. After studying the plenary meeting's draft resolution Lenin recommended indicating in it that despite basic political differences between the various trends "the class-conscious workers, who are perfectly well aware of these political differences, nevertheless, together with the vast majority of the workers, desire and demand unity of action on practical issues most urgent and close to the interests of the workers".** He thus re-emphasised that the issue in hand must concern, first and foremost, the workers' concrete requirements in the struggle for which a united front could be established. On the content of the united front tactics he wrote: "The purpose and sense of the tactics of the united front consist in drawing more and more masses of the workers into the struggle against capital, even if it means making repeated offers to the leaders of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals to wage this struggle together."***

At its plenary meeting the Comintern Executive decided to take part in the proposed conference of all workers' organisations in the world and suggested inviting all trade unions, and their national and international associations.

While the Comintern sought co-operation with the representatives of all three Internationals in order to achieve united action by the workers' organisations, the Second International pursued the aim of pressuring the Soviet Government and used every pretext for wrecking the efforts to form a united front. Subsequently, Artur Crispian, who was prominent in the Two-and-a-Half International, wrote that the Right Socialists heading the Second International "would not hear of convening a world socialist conference to serve as the beginning of proletarian unity in the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 42, p. 394.

** Ibid., p. 400.

*** Ibid., p. 411.

class struggle. Besides, they could not call for a struggle against the policy of governments of which their Party comrades were members.

"For the Right Socialists it was important, by means of underhand machinations, to make the masses believe that others were to blame for the disruption of a world socialist conference. On the other hand, an outright refusal would have made a bad impression on their supporters and forced them to think. The world thus witnessed a spectacle in which, at general meetings of the three Executive Committees, the Right Socialists hurled accusations at the Communists in an effort to prove that no joint action with the Communists was possible."*

In reply to the Two-and-a-Half International's call for a world conference, published in January 1922, the leadership of the Second International declared that as a condition for convening the conference the Comintern had to give up setting up Communist cells in the trade unions, secure to Georgia the right of self-determination (i.e., the restoration of Menshevik rule in Georgia) and the release of Socialist-Revolutionaries arrested by the Soviet authorities for counter-revolutionary terrorist activity. The leadership of the Second International believed that these demands, which were in the nature of an ultimatum, would cause the delegation of the Comintern Executive to give up the talks and thereby make it possible to blame the Communists for wrecking the united front.

The conference of representatives of the three Internationals opened in Berlin on April 2, 1922. On behalf of the Comintern Executive delegation, Clara Zetkin declared:

"Without for a moment concealing what separates it from the reformist and semi-reformist parties, the delegation of the Communist International is fully prepared to advocate a joint struggle of the international proletariat. It can do this all the more easily because it is convinced that every day of the struggle and its entire experience will prove to the proletarians of all countries that no compromises with capitalism can ensure world peace and human existence, that this goal can only be attained by the victory of the proletariat, which must triumphantly take the arrangement and order of the whole world into its powerful hands

* *Die Freiheit*, April 16, 1922.

in order to organise them in conformity with the interests of the overwhelming majority of mankind.”*

The delegation of the Second International (headed by Emile Vandervelde), supported by the delegation of the Two-and-a-Half International, repeated its preliminary conditions, which, in effect, were tantamount to interference in the internal affairs of Soviet Russia and the Comintern. In order to frustrate this design the delegation of the Comintern Executive agreed that the Soviet authorities would not apply the death sentence to the Socialist-Revolutionary terrorists and would permit representatives of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals to attend their trial. Although Lenin considered that the agreement had to be ratified, he sternly criticised the unilateral concessions made by the Comintern representatives.**

The conference passed a resolution recognising the possibility of joint action on April 20 (in connection with the International Economic Conference in Genoa) and on May 1, 1922 under slogans calling for an eight-hour working day, the defence of the Russian revolution, aid to famine-stricken areas in Russia, the resumption by all countries of political and economic relations with Soviet Russia and the establishment of a united proletarian front on the national and international levels. The conference expressed itself in favour of convening a world congress of workers' organisations as soon as possible and adopted a decision to set up a Committee of Nine to prepare for such a congress. However no definite agreement was reached on the date of this congress.

After carefully analysing the results of the Berlin conference Lenin said he felt the agreements reached there had to be ratified without delay. He pointed out that without relaxing their criticism of the reformists the Communists had to display the maximum flexibility so that this criticism “should tend to be of a clarifying nature, made with particular patience and thoroughness, so as not to scare away these workers with harsh words, and bring home to them the irreconcilable contradictions between the slogans their

* *International Socialist Conference (Joint Sitting of the Executive Committees of Three Internationals)*, Verbatim Report, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1922, pp. 14-15.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, pp. 330-34.

representatives have adopted in Berlin (for example, the fight against capital, the eight-hour day, defence of Soviet Russia, aid to the famine-stricken) and the entire reformist policy".*

On May 16, 1922, in order to speed up the convocation of the world congress, which the reformists were delaying under various pretexts, a plenary meeting of the RCP(B) Central Committee passed a decision recommending that the Comintern Executive drop the slogan calling for the defence of Soviet Russia and concentrate on the struggle for an eight-hour working day, against unemployment and so on. The Presidium of the Comintern Executive instructed its delegation to inform the Committee of Nine of this, stressing that this statement of the Russian Communists proved there were no grounds for the repeated assertions of the leaders of the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals that in pressing for a united front the Comintern was guided solely by the state interests of Soviet Russia.

In spite of everything, the Communist International did not succeed in securing united action by all international proletarian organisations in the struggle for the vital demands of the working people. Behind the backs of the Committee of Nine the reformists from the leading parties in the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals arranged to hold an international workers' conference without the participation of the Communists. This predetermined the results of the committee's meeting, which was held on May 23. The delegation of the Comintern Executive withdrew from the committee.

As a result of the divisive policy pursued by the Right-centrist leaders, the attempt to set up a united workers' front on an international scale in the spring of 1922 ended in failure. Another factor contributing to this was that the mass movement for a united front was not strong enough to compel the Social-Democratic leaders to agree to united action with the Communists. Nevertheless, the Comintern called on Communists to continue implementing united front tactics in spite of the resistance of the reformist leaders. In June 1922 an extended plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive approved the work of its delegation

* Ibid., Vol. 42, p. 416.

at the Berlin conference and underscored the need for further efforts to achieve a united front.

* * *

In charting the policy of the Communist Parties the Comintern Executive devoted considerable attention to the so-called transitional demands, i.e., demands which the Communists had put forward as best meeting the specifics of individual countries and the concrete ways of bringing the masses round to the realisation of the tasks of the struggle for socialism. In a letter of December 15, 1921 the Secretariat of the Comintern Executive called upon the Communist Parties carefully to draw up the transitional demands in conformity with the conditions obtaining in their respective countries and to inform the Comintern Executive of them to enable it to generalise their experience. "As time passes the Communist Parties are finding they have to concern themselves increasingly with problems raised by the policy of the day," the letter stated. "They must react to the concrete measures taken by the bourgeois governments and make concrete proposals to these governments in order to improve the situation. It is important that the Executive Committee should study all these questions in their general relationship to each other in order to help the Communist Parties utilise their mutual experience. It therefore requests all the Communist Parties to collect and inform it of the data on the measures they have taken to date and the demands they have put forward on questions of social and economic policy, taxation, and juridical and constitutional problems, in short, on everything bearing on our demands on the bourgeois governments."*

It was not easy to draw up the transitional demands. The belief that the struggle for transitional demands would lead away from the preparations for the proletarian revolution had to be surmounted. "Unquestionably, there was the suspicion in our own ranks that the united front slogan was a deviation from our direct road to the struggle for the dictatorship," stated the Comintern Executive's letter of January 10, 1922 to the Communist Party of Germany.

* *The Executive Committee and Presidium of the Comintern EC...*, p. 324.

"But the struggle for the dictatorship is inconceivable as long as the broad masses of the proletariat, its overwhelming majority, do not unite with iron determination for the common struggle against the bourgeoisie. This determination can only take shape when the workers try all the democratic ways and go through all forms of partial struggle so as to realise in the end that there is no other way save communism. To make this moment come and in order that the Communist Party should become the leader of the proletariat, it must, while carrying on the struggle side by side with the working class, pass through all the intermediate stages and be steadfastly true to it without forgetting its own banner. The Party must have the courage to take the responsibility for everything needed by the working class, even temporary requirements like a workers' government."*

The question of transitional demands was extensively debated on the Comintern Executive's Programme Committee, which was set up in the summer of 1922. At a plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive it was stressed that the Communist Parties had to find the link that would connect the united front policy with the prospects of the struggle for power. Two standpoints clashed over the slogan of a workers' government. One was expressed by Zinoviev, who declared at the Comintern Executive plenary meeting that a workers' government was the same thing as the dictatorship of the proletariat, that it was the pseudonym of the Soviet Government. This point of view, which rejected the significance of the workers' government slogan as being a transitional demand on the road to the dictatorship of the proletariat, was strongly supported by all Leftist sectarian elements in the Communist Parties. In the Communist Party of Italy Amadeo Bordiga demanded that this slogan should be regarded as a terminological equivalent of the dictatorship of the proletariat and declared that no agreement of a parliamentary nature should be tolerated with other factions for the establishment of a democratic and constitutional government.

In opposition to this doctrinaire, sectarian view, many members of the Comintern Executive's Programme Com-

* Ibid., p. 434.

mittee (C. Zetkin, E. Varga, B. Šmeral and others) pressed for a deep-going elaboration of the transitional economic and political slogans. At a sitting of the committee on June 28, 1922, Šmeral said that "the workers' government demanded by us must have a real content. Since that is the case our programme must not only contain a demand for a workers' government generally but also state what, in our opinion, are the tasks of such a government".* Šmeral suggested basing the programme for a workers' government on a draft programme of the proletarian Party drawn up by Lenin in the spring of 1917.**

The workers' government thesis, fruitful theoretically and extremely important as a practical slogan of struggle, was broadly discussed in the Comintern and in a number of its sections. For instance, at a conference of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia in September 1922 it was stressed that all concrete demands could be achieved provided the workers set up an organ capable of imposing its will on the bourgeoisie. The Czechoslovak Communists believed that in the situation obtaining in their country at the time such an organ could be a workers' government on condition the workers formed proletarian united front committees everywhere. A workers' government, the conference resolution stated, did not emerge as a result of a simple parliamentary combination. It was created in the course of the movement for a united front, by pressure from below. Such a government had to carry out measures of a revolutionary-democratic nature in line with the propositions in Lenin's "The Impending Catastrophe and How to Combat It".

In the autumn of 1922 the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany drafted a Party Programme, which gave prominence to transitional measures for the conquest of political power, including the slogan of a workers' government. It was noted that this slogan conformed to the task of liberating the proletarian masses from the power and influence of the bourgeoisie "in a period when the independent mass movement of the proletariat has reached definite height and breadth, when the abyss between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and the workers'

* *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 22, 1922, p. 5885.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, pp. 55-91.

leaders linked with it has widened but the majority of the proletariat is not yet ready to blow up the framework of bourgeois democracy".* Therefore, founded on energetic action by the masses, the demand for a workers' government could be the point of departure for the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. The tasks of such a government, relying on armed workers, included the implementation of political, economic and financial measures, which while formally remaining within the framework of the bourgeois system would in fact restrict the right of the capitalists to dispose of their property and profits. The resistance of the bourgeoisie would compel the workers' government to go beyond half-way measures and bring the masses round to appreciating the need for a proletarian dictatorship.

The elaboration of the problem of a workers' government as a possible immediate transitional stage of the development of the class struggle in the capitalist countries under conditions where a drive was under way to secure a united workers' front was an indication that the young Communist Parties were maturing theoretically and politically.

United action was a particularly pressing problem in Italy, where Mussolini's fascist gangs, supported by the big bourgeoisie and landowners and with the overt encouragement and sometimes help of the state apparatus, were making a bid for power. They terrorised the working people and used force to suppress the resistance of the workers and democratic strata. In a situation where all the anti-fascist forces had to be united against fascism, which was the chief enemy, the leadership of the Communist Party headed by Amadeo Bordiga clung to a sectarian, doctrinaire stand. Failing to understand the substance of fascism, Bordiga and his supporters rejected agreement with other anti-fascist parties and organisations. This prevented the working class from isolating the reactionaries and establishing co-operation with all forces capable of fighting fascism and promoting the country's democratic development.

The Comintern Executive made every effort to help the young Communist Party of Italy to surmount sectarianism and "Leftism". In March 1922 a Comintern Executive representative, Vasil Kolarov, underscored that the struggle

* *Kommunistichesky International*, No. 23, 1922, p. 6206.

against fascism was the chief item on the agenda in Italy. The Comintern called on the Communists and Socialists of Italy to "close ranks and unite millions of the urban and rural proletariat round the workers' government slogan for a common struggle against the growing impoverishment of the proletariat and the intensifying onslaught of the fascist reaction".* It pressed for co-operation between the Communist and Socialist Parties, and after the reformists were expelled from the Socialist Party in the autumn of 1922, for the integration of these two Parties on communist principles.

In a talk with Italian Communists after the fascists had seized power in October 1922, Lenin drew their attention to the importance of starting a struggle for democracy. "The working class always fights to win and uphold democratic rights even if they are limited by bourgeois power," the Italian Communist Camilla Ravera wrote, recalling Lenin's words. "And when it loses them it fights to regain them and, at the same time, looks for allies. . . . There is long and hard work ahead of us. The main thing is never, under any circumstances, to lose contact with the workers, the peasants, the women, with the life of the whole people."**

Fascism's triumph in Italy was a heavy blow to the Italian and international working class. The communist movement found itself faced with the task of evolving effective means and methods of struggle against the fascist dictatorship, which was threatening to spread to other countries, and of determining this struggle's place and importance in the general movement of the proletariat for the attainment of its historic aims. A large role was played in this by the decisions of the Fourth Comintern Congress.

* * *

This Congress opened in Petrograd on November 5, 1922, and then continued its sittings in Moscow. The main problem before it was the ways and means to be adopted by the Communist Parties in their drive for a united workers' front.

The Congress noted that capitalism was continuing its

* *Pravda*, July 29, 1922.

** *On Lenin. Reminiscences by Foreign Contemporaries*, p. 471.

offensive against the working class and that a particularly grave danger lay in the spread of fascism. It was pointed out that in addition to forming armed fighting organisations the fascists were resorting to social and nationalistic demagoguery in order to build up a foundation for themselves among the peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie and even backward sections of the proletariat. They were reinforcing "White" terror with a mass reactionary movement. The Communist Parties, stated the theses adopted by the Congress, "must head the working class in the struggle against the fascist gangs, energetically employing the united front tactics here as well and necessarily resorting to illegal methods of organisation".*

The Communist International believed that the further deepening of the class antagonisms in the capitalist countries could confront the proletariat with the task of directly accomplishing the proletarian revolution and also with the tasks of the transitional, democratic stage of the struggle. Taking into consideration the possibility that the tasks of the transitional stage might move to the forefront, the Congress closely examined the united front tactics and the prospects for the movement's further development, linking it up with the struggle for a workers' government. "The united front tactics will be of decisive importance for a whole epoch,"** it was underscored in the documents adopted by the Congress.

On the basis of Lenin's definition of these tactics, the Congress reiterated that Communists had to be prepared to carry on the struggle jointly with all workers belonging to other parties or groups and with all non-Party workers in defence of their basic interests. In the course of this struggle they had to work towards the organised unity of the masses, setting up various united front organs in the shape of factory committees, control commissions consisting of workers of all parties, action committees, and so forth. The Congress underlined the importance of the struggle for unity among trade unions and other mass organisations of the working people.

While concentrating on establishing a united front from below, the Communists, it was stated, should not reject

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 297.

** *Ibid.*, p. 300.

talks with the leadership of other workers' parties. The masses should be kept fully informed of the course of such talks. A special point made at the Congress was that the independence and agitation of the Communist Parties should not be subjected to restriction. The Congress approved the Comintern Executive's December theses, appending them to the theses on tactics.

In line with Lenin's policy of uniting the working class, the Congress adopted an Open Letter to the Hague Peace Congress convened by the Amsterdam International, to the Second and Two-and-a-Half Internationals and to the trade unions of all countries, proposing a united front with the purpose of fighting for the elementary rights and interests of the working class and for peace among nations. "The Communist International does not expect the parties of the Second International and the Vienna Workers' Union or the leaders of the Amsterdam Trade Union International, to fight for the dictatorship of the proletariat, which was and is our goal," the Open Letter started. "But we ask them if they will fight against the dictatorship of capital, if they are willing at least to utilise the last vestiges of democracy for the purpose of organising resistance to the victory of this same capital which transformed the world into one great grave, and is once again digging fresh graves for our proletarian youth?"*

The reformist leadership of the Second, Two-and-a-Half and Amsterdam Internationals ignored the Open Letter.

In amplifying on the strategy and tactics of the international communist movement, the Congress examined the question of the workers' government slogan. As a pressing political demand its significance was greatest in countries where the bourgeois system was particularly shaky. Thus, the Congress linked the possibility of setting up a workers' government with a political crisis springing from an aggravation of the class struggle. It defined the possible composition and character of a workers' government relying on a united proletarian front. "The Communists counterpose the open or camouflaged bourgeois-Social-Democratic coalition with a united front of all working people and an economic and political coalition of all workers' parties for the struggle against bourgeois power and for its final

* *International Press Correspondence*, No. 113, 1922, p. 945.

overthrow. As a result of the united action of all the workers against the bourgeoisie, the entire state apparatus must pass into the hands of a workers' government, thereby strengthening the dominant position of the working class."*

Such a government, the Congress pointed out, could emerge only on the basis of a mass movement. Aided by militant workers' organs, its task would be to arm the proletariat, disarm bourgeois counter-revolutionary organisations, establish control over production, shift the main burden of taxation to the propertied classes and break the resistance of the counter-revolutionary bourgeoisie. The consistent implementation of this revolutionary-democratic programme would facilitate the revolutionary education of the masses and prepare them for the transition to the socialist revolution.

The Congress pointed to the possibility of Communists forming such a government jointly with non-communist workers' parties and organisations. However, the reservation was made that such participation was possible provided the government really fought the bourgeoisie and that the Communists in it were strictly accountable to their Party and would work in close contact with the revolutionary organisations of the masses. The workers' or workers' and peasants' governments in which Communists could participate, the Congress theses stated, would not be organs of the dictatorship of the proletariat but they could become an important starting-point for the establishment of such a dictatorship.

The Congress' enlargement on the slogan of a workers' government as a concrete objective of the united front showed that the Comintern had drawn the conclusion that in the developed capitalist countries the revolution could be promoted through a democratic struggle and a number of transitional stages leading to the dictatorship of the proletariat. This was a major step in the development of the strategy of the international communist movement.

The Congress drew special attention to the transitional demands also during the debate on the draft programme of the Comintern.

This draft, drawn up by Bukharin, was limited to a characteristic of capitalism and imperialism, general pro-

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 301.

positions on communist society and a summary of the tasks of the proletarian revolution and the dictatorship of the proletariat.* There was not a word about how the Communist Parties were to go about preparing and achieving the proletarian revolution. On the whole, Bukharin did not feel it was necessary that the Comintern programme should substantiate the general transitional and partial demands.

The draft programme was not discussed in advance by the RCP(B) delegation. In his report to the Congress Lenin suggested that it should limit itself to a general discussion of the programme, and that the adoption of the programme should be postponed to allow for a more comprehensive study.** The RCP(B) delegation requested the Congress Presidium to give it the opportunity to discuss at its own sitting the question of the place of the transitional demands in the Comintern programme. This request was granted.

On November 20 at a sitting presided over by Lenin the RCP(B) delegation scrutinised the draft Comintern programme and declared itself in favour of including transitional demands in the programme and substantiating them in the programme's general section. "The theoretical basis for all such transition or limited demands," Lenin wrote, "should be definitely stated in the general programme. . . .""*** He dictated the key points of the resolution, which pointed out that in their programmes the Communist Parties should show the need for a struggle for transitional demands in accordance with the obtaining conditions.

Thus, Lenin and the Fourth Congress of the Comintern once again stressed the vital importance of working out transitional slogans. The Congress reiterated the Comintern's resolute opposition to the Leftist underestimation of the importance of partial and transitional demands, the struggle for which enabled the Parties to approach the struggle for socialism under the specific conditions obtaining in their respective countries. At the same time, the Congress sounded a serious warning against attempts to "use limited demands to obscure and side-track the basic revolutionary task".****

* *On the Question of the Programme of the Communist International (Materials)*, Russ. ed., Krasnaya Nov Publishers, Moscow, 1924, pp. 53-66.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 421.

*** Ibid., Vol. 42, p. 428.

**** Ibid.

All the decisions passed at the Congress oriented the Communist Parties on the creative application of Marxist-Leninist theory and the experience of the revolutionary movement to the conditions obtaining in their respective countries. This was also the orientation given to Communists by Lenin in his report *Five Years of the Russian Revolution and the Prospects of the World Revolution*, which was the major landmark of the Congress. It was the last speech made by the founder and leader of the Communist International to representatives of the world communist movement. This report, which dealt, in particular, with the New Economic Policy, a key problem of the situation in Soviet Russia at the time, armed the international communist movement with the experience of the world's first socialist state. Lenin called on the Communists to learn to utilise creatively the experience of the world communist movement, especially of the RCP(B). Every Party, he said, had to master the entire wealth of revolutionary theory and practice, learn from the masses and strengthen its links with them, understand the specifics of the class struggle and the development of the revolution in its own country, and pursue a policy conforming to the situation, the alignment of class forces, the tasks of the revolutionary struggle in its own country and the tasks of the world revolutionary movement. "I am sure," he said, "that in this connection we must tell not only the Russians, but the foreign comrades as well, that the most important thing in the period we are now entering is to study. We are studying in the general sense. They, however, must study in the special sense, in order that they may really understand the organisation, structure, method and content of revolutionary work. If they do that, I am sure the prospects of the world revolution will be not only good, but excellent."*

Lenin's propositions on the united workers' front policy in the capitalist countries and on a united anti-imperialist front in the colonies and dependent countries, and the prominence given to the struggle for the establishment of a workers' government as a possible means of bringing the working class to power creatively enriched the strategy and tactics of the international revolutionary proletarian movement.

* Ibid., Vol. 33, pp. 432-33.

STRATEGY AND TACTICS OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTIES IN THE STRUGGLE AGAINST FASCISM

The united workers' front policy evolved under Lenin's guidance was of immense importance to the subsequent class struggle in the capitalist countries. In a situation witnessing the temporary or partial stabilisation of capitalism, the cardinal tasks confronting the communist movement were to resist the capitalist offensive, strengthen the Communist Parties and win the support of the majority of the proletariat and other strata of working people.

In the European countries the Communist Parties organised large-scale actions in which Social-Democrats and members of reformist trade unions participated jointly with the Communists. The most striking example of such actions was the campaign for the confiscation, without compensation, of the property of the aristocratic families in Germany. The Communist Party of Germany suggested a referendum. There was such wide popular response to this suggestion that the Social-Democratic leaders and the leadership of some democratic organisations agreed to join the Communist Party in drawing up a law and submitting it to a referendum. In the referendum, which was held in June 1926, 14,500,000 people, i.e., nearly half of the politically active population, supported the Communist programme. This vividly demonstrated the great rallying effect of demands common to all the working people. Unfortunately, the Left forces were unable to follow up this success.

Important steps were taken by the Communist Party of Italy in the drive for united action by the workers and the democratic, anti-fascist forces. After the fascists assassinated the Socialist leader Giacomo Matteotti, the Communists and members of other opposition parties withdrew from the parliament and set up the Aventine bloc. In this bloc the Communist Party of Italy made every effort to unite the anti-fascists and pressed for determined action. It proposed that the Aventine bloc should proclaim itself the country's real parliament and call for a general strike against fascism.

In 1925, under the slogan of united action by workers and all opponents of war, the Communist Party of France stirred the people to action against the colonial wars of French imperialism in Morocco and Syria. The political strike organised by the Communists involved 900,000 persons.

An important landmark in the history of the British working-class movement was the establishment in the spring of 1925 of the Anglo-Russian Committee, which proclaimed that its aims were to strengthen relations between Soviet and British trade unions and promote their joint struggle for the unity of the international trade union movement and also their struggle against the capitalist offensive and the threat of an anti-Soviet war.

The ideological and organisational defeat of Trotskyism, which in 1926-27 attacked the general line of the Comintern and tried to induce the Communist Parties to adopt an adventurist, petty-bourgeois policy, did much to further the communist movement. The theses of Trotsky and his supporters, who believed socialism could not triumph in one country taken separately and that the world revolution had to be "pushed" with every possible means, were totally demolished by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Comintern. This removed a major obstacle to the unity of all the revolutionary forces in the struggle against imperialism.

The Comintern and its sections pursued the united workers' front policy and the line of drawing the semi-proletarian masses into this front as part and parcel of the drive to strengthen the Communist Parties ideologically, politically and organisationally. It constantly drew attention to the fact that one of the salient features of the new type of Party is its ability to find the road to the masses in any, even the most difficult, situation.

However, despite the efforts of the Comintern and the Communist Parties to secure united action by all contingents of the working class and draw the broad semi-proletarian masses into the struggle, this did not become the guideline in the working-class movement of those years.

Enormous difficulties were created for united proletarian action against capitalism by the Right-Socialist policy of class co-operation with the bourgeoisie. In a situation where the policy of the Right Socialists was adversely affecting numerous determined actions by the workers, many Communists began to demand a sharp polemic with the Social-Democratic movement as a whole and a revision of some of the propositions linked with the united workers' front policy.

At the close of 1927 the Communist International yielded to pressure from the "Lefts" and evolved a new tactical

line, which subsequently became known as the "class against class" tactics. Its aim was to step up the militant activity of the working class. In some instances these tactics helped the Communists to break the resistance of the reformist leaders to action by the masses. But this new guideline, as Academician B. N. Ponomarev pointed out, was linked with propositions restricting the united workers' front policy.* In accordance with this new guideline the reformist organisations were regarded as a force siding completely with the bourgeoisie and it was therefore believed that working-class unity could only be achieved by workers making a clean break with these organisations. Joint action of the Communist and Social-Democratic parties was ruled out. In the decisions passed by the 9th plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive in February 1928 on the British and French questions the new tactics were characterised as an increasingly clear-cut struggle against the Social-Democratic parties. Moreover, the formula "class against class" did not orient the Communists on a consistent drive to win for the proletariat allies from among other classes and social groups. The practical implementation of the "class against class" tactics increased tension between the Communists and the workers belonging to reformist organisations, and in many cases they led to the isolation of militant revolutionary workers.

The intensification of the class struggle was the inevitable result of the world economic crisis of 1929-33, which was the most destructive crisis in the history of capitalism. The strike movement mounted. The struggle of the unemployed spread rapidly. Dissatisfaction and unrest gripped the peasant masses and the urban middle strata.

The Soviet Union's achievements powerfully influenced the advanced sections of the proletariat throughout the world. The building of socialism in the USSR, the rapid rate of industrialisation, the collectivisation of agriculture and the far-reaching cultural revolution strikingly demonstrated the viability of the new social system. The living example of socialist construction made the ideals of socialism increasingly more attractive for millions of working people all over the world.

When in Soviet Russia socialism became a reality and the positions of capitalism weakened under the blows of the

* *Kommunist*, No. 5, 1969, p. 24.

crisis, the most reactionary circles of the bourgeoisie began to regroup their forces. In many countries they put their stake on fascism, seeing it as a means of ruthlessly crushing the revolutionary forces and shifting the entire burden of the economic crisis onto the working people. Also extremely attractive to world imperialism was the possibility of using fascism as a strike force against the USSR. International reaction linked its plans for destroying the world's first socialist country with the fascist movement.

In face of the offensive by imperialist reaction and fascism, the working class had to mobilise its forces quickly and effectively. But this was hindered by the split in its ranks.

Acting against the interests of the working class the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic parties pursued a policy of averting the proletarian revolution. They aimed their sharpest arrows against the Communists and revolutionary proletarians and, at the same time, made increasingly larger concessions to the ruling bourgeoisie. In some cases they did not scruple to use weapons against the revolutionary workers. In 1929, acting on orders from its Commissioner Zoergiebel, a Social-Democrat, the Berlin police shot down the May Day demonstration. This, the German Communists wrote, raised a wall of blood* between them and the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party and widened the split in the working class. Actions of this kind fostered hatred for the Social-Democratic leaders among the revolutionary workers, and in many cases this hatred spread to Social-Democratic workers.

With the deepening of the economic crisis the leaders of Right-wing Social-Democracy began to adopt a steadily more pronounced anti-communist stand as they looked for ways of preventing a revolutionary explosion. For instance, the Fourth Congress of the Labour and Socialist International (July-August 1931) concentrated chiefly on how to save capitalist Germany from economic collapse and thereby secure the whole of Europe against social upheavals. The Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic parties openly called for the defence of the "temple" of capitalist civilisation against the revolutionary workers. This policy led to the abandonment of a determined struggle against fascism, helped to further the split in the working class and weaken

* *Inprekorr*, No. 49, 1932, p. 1553.

it in face of the offensive by the reactionaries. The line steered by the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic parties was bitterly denounced by revolutionary workers and earned the condemnation of the Social-Democratic rank and file and members of reformist trade unions.

During these turbulent years a resolute and uncompromising struggle against the offensive of imperialist reaction and fascism was headed by the communist movement. The Comintern ceaselessly warned that as the crisis and the class struggle deepened the bourgeoisie would increasingly take the road of fascism, send terrorist gangs against revolutionary workers' organisations and intensify the preparations for an imperialist war against the Soviet Union. At its 11th plenary meeting in March-April 1931 the Comintern Executive called on the Communist Parties to start a struggle in the following main areas: (1) against the capitalist offensive and against wage reductions and mass dismissals; for higher wages and better social insurance; for immediate relief to the unemployed; (2) against the bourgeois dictatorship in all its forms; against terror by entrepreneurs and the police; for the freedom of revolutionary workers' organisations; for disarmament and the disbandment of fascist organisations; for the formation of mass self-defence detachments against the fascists; for the organisation of mass political strikes; (3) against the preparations for an imperialist war and anti-Soviet intervention; against intervention in the region of the revolutionary bases in China.*

In the actions to press home these demands the Communists made every effort to win the support of the majority of the working class. This immediately raised the question of how to fight consistently for the day-to-day interests of the working class and the semi-proletarian masses of town and country. The fact that there were considerably more possibilities for mobilising the broad masses for the struggle made this a particularly urgent issue.

At the 12th plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive (August-September 1932), Otto Kuusinen delivered a report in which he underscored that the Communist Parties had to base their united front policy on demands that were particularly close to the workers and reflected their direct interests. This, he pointed out, was the only way in which the Com-

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 965.

munists could win the trust of non-Party and also of Social-Democratic and syndicalist workers. Kuusinen recommended that in the struggle for united proletarian action the Communist Parties should in definite cases try to enlist the support primarily of reformist trade union organisations and even local Social-Democratic organisations.* This recommendation, in effect, nullified the former thesis that the Social-Democratic parties and reformist trade unions, down to their primary links, were turning fascist and that, as a consequence, no agreement with them could be reached.

At the plenary meeting Ernst Thälmann, Klement Gottwald and the leaders of other Communist Parties stressed that the sectarian attitude to the reformist trade unions had to be dropped, that they should not be regarded as a "school of capitalism" or as a "solidly reactionary mass" and that no slogans against these trade unions should be issued. On the contrary, they said, it was necessary to go to them, gradually win the trust of their members and establish personal friendly relations with Social-Democratic workers.**

The Comintern strove to overcome the narrowness of its former propositions, which stated that only Communists could lead the economic battles and demanded the organisational separation of the revolutionary trade union opposition from the reformist trade unions. In a number of cases the slogan that Communists alone could lead the economic battles gave rise to friction between the Communists and the mass of workers united in reformist trade unions. Analysing these mistakes, the plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive drove home the point that Lenin's injunction to Communists to work in the reformist trade unions should always be borne in mind. It stated that the struggle for the immediate demands of the masses was the basic means of leading the working people to major revolutionary battles.

The decisions adopted by this plenary meeting showed that the Comintern and the Communist Parties were anxious to restore the Leninist united front tactics. This was also demonstrated by the fact that a struggle against Right opportunism and against Left-sectarian elements and groups hindering anti-fascist activity on a massive scale was started

* 12th Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive Committee, Verbatim report, Russ. ed., Vol. I, Moscow, 1933, pp. 30-31.

** Ibid., pp. 58, 100-01.

in the communist movement. The Leftist groups in the Communist Parties of France (Henri Barbé—Pierre Célor), Germany (Heinz Neumann—Hermann Remmele) and Spain (José Bullejos—Trilla) were defeated ideologically, politically and organisationally in 1931-32.

In face of the mounting threat of fascism and war, the Comintern and its sections called for the solidarity of all anti-fascist workers. This call was founded on its awareness of the nature and aims of fascism. More accurately than any other organisation, the Comintern defined fascism as being the tool of the big bourgeoisie and other reactionary forces, who, under the general crisis of capitalism, were trying to crush the working-class movement by terrorist methods and strengthen capitalism. Scathing criticism was levelled at the Social-Democratic thesis that most of the "democratic" countries of Europe were not susceptible to fascism and that the very existence of bourgeois-democratic states and social institutions was a guarantee against the fascist menace.

Furthermore, the Comintern condemned the fatalistic views that fascism was the inevitable historical stage of the disintegration of the capitalist system. In practice, views of this kind, which were linked with the Leftist theories predicting the rapid and almost automatic collapse of fascism, led to an underestimation of the danger of fascism and a belittlement of the alliance of the proletariat with other strata of the working people: if capitalism was nearing collapse and a powerful army of the proletarian revolution was not needed for its destruction, it was not necessary to win allies. As early as 1931 the Comintern stressed that fascism could not be regarded solely as a sign of the disintegration and weakening of capitalism, or as an inescapable stage of the downfall of capitalism. The view that the growth of fascism was laying the foundations for the victory of the proletariat was categorically rejected. Fascism, Dmitry Manuilsky pointed out at the 11th plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive, was not only an indication of capitalism's crisis but also "a form of the capitalist offensive containing elements allowing that crisis to be overcome. . . . Fascism is capitalism's offensive and defence".* For that reason the Comintern oriented the Communist Parties on an unremitting struggle not only

* *11th Plenary Meeting of the Comintern Executive Committee*, Verbatim report, Russ. ed., Issue I, Moscow, 1932, p. 606.

against the fascist dictatorships but also against the fascistisation of the bourgeois-democratic regimes and against any actions clearing the road to fascism.

During the struggle against fascism the Communist Parties increasingly felt that it was necessary to unite all the working people against this ruthless enemy. In the tense situation in Germany, where the nazis were becoming the strongest party, the Communist Party of Germany made every effort to unite the anti-fascist workers on the basis of the "Programme for the Social and National Liberation of the German People", which it had drawn up in 1930. The Party unequivocally stated that the united workers' front was the principal link of its policy and the only means for stopping the nazis. In the summer of 1932 the CPG organised an "anti-fascist action" campaign. Its leader, Ernst Thälmann, urgently called on the Social-Democratic workers to unite against the nazis to prevent Germany from being overrun by terror. The persevering efforts of the German Communists to form a united front against fascism enhanced the CPG's prestige and gave it a steadily growing membership. The struggle against fascism was intensified by the Communist Parties of France, Spain, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Bulgaria, Greece, the USA and other countries.

However, in many cases the tactics employed by the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries were not effective enough. They stemmed from the former strategy, which did not conform to the changed alignment of class forces in the world. The communist movement linked the struggle of the workers against the offensive of reaction and fascism with the direct preparations for the socialist revolution. The establishment of the proletarian dictatorship was set as an immediate political task. However, this slogan, which showed that the Communists had not lost their revolutionary spirit and were true to the end goal of their struggle, did not fit in with the complex and contradictory situation that was emerging in the capitalist countries at the time. It was not supported by the majority of the working class and other strata of working people. Nonetheless, the turn of a section of the workers towards the Communist Parties and the cases of former Social-Democrats joining them were assessed as the beginning of a struggle by the masses against all forms of bourgeois power. Klement Gottwald wrote that in the communist movement many people believed that "the mass

of Socialist workers look at things in the same way as we Communists, i.e., we take what has happened for what we desire".*

The widening contradictions of imperialism and the further offensive of reaction and fascism objectively accentuated general democratic tasks, which had a strikingly anti-fascist and anti-monopoly content. The Comintern and its national sections did not immediately appreciate the changed situation and the accompanying need for concentrating all efforts on democratic, anti-fascist tasks.

Another circumstance preventing the Communist Parties from adopting a new policy was that they regarded Social-Democracy as social-fascism and attacked chiefly the Social-Democratic Parties and the intermediate forces which it was vital to win to the anti-fascist front. The view assessing Social-Democracy as social-fascism expressed the workers' resentment of the fact that some of the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders were more and more frequently using means of violence, including arms, against the revolutionary masses. As a whole, however, the formula "social-fascism" was a grave mistake for it ignored the anti-fascist trends in the Social-Democratic Parties and rejected the need and necessity for a joint struggle of the Communists and Social-Democrats against fascism and for the satisfaction of the basic requirements of the working people. At the scientific conference held to mark the 50th anniversary of the Comintern M. A. Suslov said: "There was no justification for the thesis that Social-Democracy was the greatest danger. As a result, the main blow was for some time aimed at it and this, in effect, led to sectarianism."**

The nazis' accession to power in 1933, the savage reign of terror instituted by the nazi gangs in Germany and the break up of all political and economic organisations of the German working class were a heavy blow to the international working class. The European proletariat regarded the seizure of power by the nazis "as a blow against itself, as a threat and menace which imperiously pushed the proletarian forces to resistance and unity. In the European working-class movement the victory of nazism in Germany gave rise to a powerful aspiration for a united front, which

* *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 30, 1934, p. 48.

** *Pravda*, March 26, 1969.

not even the parties of the Second International could ignore".* The working people saw that with the victory of the nazis Germany had become a bulwark of world reaction, a flashpoint in Europe and a mailed fist flourished at the USSR. The nazi victory encouraged the most reactionary forces in the world and set off a wave of fascist offensives in France, Spain, Austria and many other countries.

In that situation the Communists were the first to start looking for realistic ways of uniting all the forces capable of opposing fascism. The Communist calls for united action against fascism now began to find a growing response among Social-Democratic workers, who could see the tragedy of Germany with their own eyes. The idea of a "non-aggression pact" between the Second and Third Internationals was advanced by the Social-Democratic workers of some countries. The Labour and Socialist International could no longer ignore the workers' growing inclination towards united action against fascism. On February 19, 1933 the Bureau of the Executive Committee of the Socialist International published an Appeal to the workers of the world stating that the Socialists were prepared to hold talks with the Comintern on joint anti-fascist action. However, the Appeal did not contain a specific programme of struggle. All it offered was that mutual attacks should cease. Nonetheless, it could play a positive role in drawing anti-fascist workers closer together.

On March 5, 1933, the Comintern Executive Committee likewise published an Appeal to the workers of all countries. This Appeal stated in part: "In face of fascism, which has started an offensive against the working class of Germany and let loose all the forces of world reaction, the Executive Committee of the Communist International calls on all the Communist Parties to make another attempt to form a united front with the Social-Democratic worker masses *through the mediation of the Social-Democratic Parties* (our italics—Authors). The Executive Committee of the Comintern makes this attempt in the firm conviction that a united front of the working class against the bourgeoisie can repulse the offensive of capitalism and fascism and greatly hasten the inevitable end of all capitalist exploitation."**

The Comintern thus proposed an agreement between the

* Wilhelm Pieck, *Reden und Aufsätze*, Vol. 1, Berlin, 1950, p. 194.

** *Pravda*, March 6, 1933.

leadership of the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties. In addition it proposed a concrete programme of united action by these parties: immediate organisation of resistance to the offensive of fascism and reaction against the political, trade union, co-operative and other organisations of the workers, on the working-class press, and on the freedom of assembly, demonstrations and strikes; resistance to the armed attacks of the fascist gangs through the formation of joint self-defence detachments; joint struggle against the falling wages and cuts in unemployment allowances. The Comintern recommended that for the period of the joint struggle against fascism and the capitalist offensive the Communist Parties should stop accentuating the polemic with the Social-Democrats and, in this respect, accept the proposals of the Labour and Socialist International. This was an important step, for it directed the attention of the Communist Parties to urgent democratic, anti-fascist tasks and was an advance towards a broader understanding of the united workers' front problem.

The leadership of the Labour and Socialist International turned down the proposals for a united front, charging the Comintern with indifference to International-level contacts and "limiting its recommendations to talks in individual countries".* The same reaction, but in a more crude manner, came from the leadership of the Social-Democratic Parties to whom the Communists proposed to form united national fronts of the working class. Despite this rejection, the Comintern and its sections continued looking for ways of uniting the anti-fascist workers.

The European Anti-Fascist Workers' Congress, held in Paris' Pleyel Hall in June 1933, helped to draw the Communists and Social-Democrats closer together. The delegates were Communists, Social-Democrats and anti-fascist intellectuals. The decisions were permeated with the idea of a broad united front of all anti-fascists, regardless of party and trade union affiliation, or religious belief, who were prepared to co-operate against fascism and in the struggle to avert another imperialist slaughter.** The European Anti-Fascist Bureau, elected at the Congress, initiated a campaign

* *The Communist International Before the Seventh World Congress*, Russ. ed., Partizdat, Moscow, 1935, p. 41.

** *Kommunistischesky International*, No. 19-20, 1933, p. 99.

to boycott German merchant ships in foreign ports, organise protest demonstrations in front of German embassies and consulates, boycott fascist films, and so on.

In the summer of 1933 the European Anti-Fascist Bureau and the World Peace Committee, set up a year earlier by the Amsterdam Anti-War Congress, merged to form the World Committee Against War and Fascism. The movement headed by this Committee played a prominent role in mobilising anti-fascists for the struggle against the nazi policy of war.

The courageous speeches of Georgi Dimitrov at the Leipzig trial in 1933 did much to activate and unite the anti-fascist forces in the world. At that trial, staged by the nazis, Dimitrov exposed the crimes of the hitlerites, who had set fire to the Reichstag for provocative purposes. He called for a united front of all anti-fascist proletarians, for joint action by the Communists and Social-Democratic workers. The mass struggle in defence of Dimitrov and the other accused acquired the nature of a world-wide campaign. Meetings, rallies and demonstrations protesting against the nazi terror were held in almost all countries. Increasing numbers of anti-fascists joined the movement. "Millions upon millions of men and women workers," Dimitrov later said, "followed the struggle in Leipzig every day. Millions upon millions of petty bourgeoisie, peasants and intellectuals sided with the united anti-fascist front."*

The growth of the anti-fascist movement markedly influenced the situation in the reformist parties and in the Labour and Socialist International. Left trends and groups began to gain strength in them; they demanded an active struggle against fascism and the conclusion of an agreement with the Communists on joint practical action in that direction. The Left Socialists made themselves heard, in particular, at the conference of the Labour and Socialist International in Paris in August 1933. The Right-wing leaders, however, once again categorically rejected the united front proposed by the Communists.**

The questions of the struggle against fascism and war occupied the central place in the proceedings of the Comintern Executive's 13th plenary meeting (November-

* *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 20-21, 1935, p. 13.

** *Populaire*, August 22, 1933.

December 1933). Fascism, it was emphatically affirmed at the plenary meeting, was the chief enemy of the working class. In this light the Communist Parties had to surmount the fatalistic view that nothing could be done to avert the approaching imperialist war and that the real revolution would begin only as a result of another imperialist war. The plenary meeting pointed out that in struggle against its chief enemy—fascism—the proletariat could delay the outbreak of war.

These were extremely important conclusions. But they were again linked with the old policy orienting the working class of the capitalist countries on a socialist revolution for which very few prerequisites existed at the time. In accordance with the old strategy, the plenary meeting insisted on assessing Social-Democracy as the principal social mainstay of the bourgeoisie, even in the fascist countries. The tactics of unity from below were considered to be in glaring contradiction to the united front tactics from above.

The stern lessons of the struggle waged by the Comintern and its sections during the years of the world economic crisis and the efforts made by the Comintern to unite the various trends of the working-class movement against fascism showed that the Communists had begun a fruitful search for new ways of uniting the working people against fascism and war. But the communist movement still had to go through major class battles in order to evolve new strategy and tactics and thereby open up broad possibilities for organising the revolutionary and democratic forces against fascism and war.

The events of 1934 were a turning point in the communist movement's drive for the anti-fascist unity of workers and all other working people. The French Communist Party was one of the first in the Comintern to adopt the new, broader united front policy calling for determined resistance to fascism and for the defence of the democratic freedoms and economic rights of the working people.

Tirelessly exposing the fascist threat and mobilising the workers for the struggle for their economic demands, the French Communist Party worked to achieve a union between the Communists and Socialists. When the French fascists made an attempt to seize power on February 6, 1934, the Communist Party appealed to all workers, regardless of party affiliation, to go out into the streets and disperse the

fascist gangs. The general strike of February 12, in which 4,500,000 people took part, and the joint actions of the Communists and Socialists throughout the country repulsed the first major attack of fascism in France.

On the basis of the lessons drawn from these developments, the French Communist Party mapped out a policy of uniting all possible allies in the struggle against fascism. "In order to ensure the defeat of fascism the Party must leave no stone unturned," stated the decision adopted by the Central Committee of the French Communist Party at its plenary meeting in March 1934. "To this end it must broaden and consolidate the results that have been achieved through united front action tactics by the masses."* The plenary meeting called on the Communists to act in defence of the interests of the peasants and urban middle strata as well.

At the National Conference of the French Communist Party in Ivres on June 23-26, 1934 it was stated that fascism was the main enemy against whom it was necessary to concentrate "the full force of mass proletarian action supported by the action of all strata of the working population".** The Conference set the task of drawing the working peasants, petty bourgeoisie and intellectuals into the struggle against fascism, for democracy and for immediate economic demands. The French Communist Party made a strong representation to the leadership of the Socialist Party to join it in a united front.

Thanks to the vigorous actions of the Communist Party agreements on united action began to be concluded between the leadership of Socialist and Communist organisations in many towns and departments. These developments led the leadership of the Socialist Party into acceptance of the FCP's proposal for a unity pact between the two parties. The pact was formally signed on July 27, 1934. The two Parties pledged to act jointly in the struggle for disarmament and the disbandment of fascist organisations and in defence of democratic freedoms. To this end they undertook to conduct national campaigns and use all the means at their disposal.*** This united action of the French proletariat greatly stren-

* *La Correspondance Internationale*, No. 34-35, 1934, p. 647.

** *Histoire du Parti communiste français*, Paris, 1964, p. 273.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 275.

ngthened the position of the working class in the country and served as a mobilising example for the working-class movement in other capitalist countries.

Dramatic events took place early in 1934 in Austria, where the fascists had gradually won stronger positions and made an attempt to seize power. In that country there was a strong Social-Democratic Party, which had the support of the overwhelming majority of the workers. It bandied "Leftist" verbiage and took every opportunity to state that it would act resolutely when the situation was ripe. Really Left elements exercised a relatively strong influence on rank-and-file Socialists. There were Social-Democratic armed detachments known as the *Schutzbund*. The Communist Party of Austria called on all workers to act resolutely together, but these calls were ignored by the leaders of the Social-Democratic Party, who held the workers back from mass action against fascism, which was growing increasingly more brazen. A belated call for a general strike was made only after the fascists began attacking the Social-Democratic Party's headquarters in Linz and then in Vienna. Armed clashes flared up on February 12. The armed struggle in which the Social-Democratic detachments were aided by the Communists lasted for four days and ended in a defeat of the workers.

The February developments in Austria were an historic test of the policy pursued by the centrist leadership of the Social-Democratic Party, which had the bulk of the working class behind it and proclaimed "Left" slogans and a "Left" policy. The defeat in Austria demonstrated the hollowness of all forms of reformist policy and tactics in face of the fascist offensive. While the example of France showed the workers of the world that fascism could be successfully repulsed through a united front, the example of Austria made them see the fatal consequences of the reformist policy of evading a determined struggle. Moreover, the events in Austria were evidence that in spite of their leaders the Social-Democratic rank and file were rising to an active class struggle. After the February battles nearly 13,000 Social-Democrats, disgusted with their reformist leaders, went over to the Communist Party.*

The struggle of the Spanish Communists enriched the in-

* *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 35, 1934, pp. 35-36.

ternational communist movement with important lessons. In order to promote the bourgeois-democratic revolution in Spain, the Communist Party advanced a slogan calling for an anti-fascist front. It regarded such a front as a broad movement of all the political forces prepared to block the road to reaction. As early as 1933 the Party succeeded in conducting individual joint actions with the Socialists and Republicans against reaction. The Spanish Young Communist League initiated co-operation with the youth organisations of the Socialist Party. In September 1934 the Communists joined the "workers' alliances" set up by the Socialists. In taking this step, the Communist Party declared that it would make every effort to draw workers' and, particularly, peasants' organisations into these "alliances" in order to turn them into organs of a united front of workers and peasants.

A general strike was staged in October 1934 in protest against the inclusion of representatives of fascist organisations in the government. The scale of this strike was greatest in Asturias where an alliance was concluded between the Socialists, the anarcho-syndicalists and the Communists.* For 15 days the workers of Asturias put up a stout armed resistance to the troops sent against them. Although reaction dealt savagely with the insurgents, the struggle taught the working class an important lesson. They realised that to defeat fascism there had to be united action by workers of all political trends and that an end had to be put to sectarianism, parochialism and claims to monopoly leadership of the movement that were typical of the policy pursued by the anarchists and by the Socialist Party. At the same time, it was proved in practice that united action by Communists, Socialists and anarchists was possible.

In Italy the links between the Communists and Socialists grew closer in the course of the resistance to fascism. The Communist and Socialist Parties concluded a pact on united action in August 1934. This pact defined the common aims in the struggle to overthrow fascism, for peace and freedom, and for an improvement of the standard of living. It became a militant programme of the anti-fascists both in emigration and in the country itself.

* *War and Revolution in Spain, 1936-1939*, Vol. I, Russ. ed., Progress Publishers, Moscow, 1968, p. 62.

The struggle for a united front of workers of all political trends against imperialist reaction, fascism and war was activated by the Communist Parties of Germany, Greece, Poland, Great Britain, Czechoslovakia, Rumania and some other countries.

Simultaneously, a discussion in which the communist movement looked for new solutions was started in the leading organs of the Comintern and in the committees set up to prepare the main items of the agenda for the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. Many prominent members of the CPSU(B) and other large sections of the Comintern (Georgi Dimitrov, Maurice Thorez, Harry Pollitt, Dmitry Manuilsky, Otto Kuusinen, Joseph Pyatnitsky, Wilhelm Pieck, Fritz Heckert, Bohumir Šmeral, Béla Kun and others) took part in the discussions.

On June 14, 1934, at a sitting of the preparatory committee for the first item of the Congress agenda, Dmitry Manuilsky spoke of the basic strategic task of the proletarian class struggle in the developed capitalist countries. He stated that the conditions obtaining in many capitalist countries did not allow setting as the immediate task the struggle for the dictatorship of the proletariat. Socialism was the end objective of the movement, but "we have to have," he said, "a more concrete programme of struggle: not a proletarian dictatorship and not socialism, but one which would lead the masses to the struggle for them".* This conformed to Lenin's insistence that the Communist Parties of the capitalist countries had to find the ways of approaching or achieving the transition to the socialist revolution in accordance with the conditions in their respective countries. The initiative in framing the key issues of the struggle for a united workers' front was taken by Dimitrov. In a letter to the Comintern Executive and the Central Committee of the CPSU(B), in his speech at a sitting of the preparatory committee on July 2, 1934 and in his outline of the report presented to this sitting he underscored that the struggle for a united workers' front had to be the central item on the agenda of the Seventh Congress of the Comintern. He urged a radical reconsideration of the tactical line and the renunciation of the assessment according to which Social-Democracy was regarded as social-

* B. Leibson and K. Shirinya, *A Turn in the Comintern Policies*, Russ. ed., Mysl Publishers, Moscow, 1965, p. 78.

fascism or the social mainstay of the bourgeoisie. Saying that it was necessary and possible to draw the members of the reformist parties and trade unions into the anti-fascist struggle, he raised the question of restoring the cohesion of the trade union movement by uniting the revolutionary and reformist trade unions.* Further, he noted that the time had come for changing the forms of leading the communist movement and for giving the Comintern sections more independence.**

At this sitting Dimitrov, Manuilsky and Kuusinen argued that the question of a united workers' front had now to be raised on a broader scale than before and that the accent in this front's programme should be not on the end goal of the Communists but on the most pressing demands of all the workers, chiefly their anti-fascist demands. The idea of enlarging the united workers' front through an alliance with non-proletarian anti-fascist strata and parties was advanced in the leading organs of the Comintern Executive and in the preparatory committees. Various points of view clashed in the course of the debate, and some of the participants (A. Lozovsky, Wilhelm Knorin and others) initially upheld guidelines that did not conform to the situation. But as the debate progressed these views were dropped. A new political orientation founded on the slogan of a united workers' and broad anti-fascist popular front was finally laid down through the joint efforts of the Comintern's leading organs and the largest Communist Parties in 1934 and in early 1935.

In October 1934, on behalf of the French Communist Party, Maurice Thorez put forward the popular front formula, which called for the establishment of a militant alliance of all proletarian and democratic forces in order to curb, disarm and disband the fascist leagues, defend democratic rights and satisfy the vital economic needs of the French people.*** Although some functionaries of the Comintern were wary of accepting this idea, the popular front slogan quickly won recognition because it conformed to the need for rapidly mobilising the people against fascism. At the close of 1934 this slogan received support in the Presidium of the

* Georgi Dimitrov, *Letters 1908-1949*, Sofia, 1962, p. 297.

** *Voprosy istorii KPSS*, No. 7, 1965, pp. 84-85.

*** *Histoire du Parti communiste français*, p. 281.

Comintern Executive, and early in 1935 many Communist Parties, overcoming the resistance of sectarian-dogmatic groups and elements, started a drive to unite all opponents of fascism in a popular front. The Communists regarded the popular front as a form of unity enabling the working class to become the leading force in the anti-fascist struggle.

An immense role in promoting the policy of rallying the working class and all democratic forces against fascism and war was played by the historic decisions adopted by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern, which was held in Moscow in July-August 1935.

The central item on the agenda was Dimitrov's report "The Fascist Offensive and the Tasks of the Communist International in the Struggle for Working-Class Unity, Against Fascism". In view of the aggravation of capitalism's general crisis and the growing revolutionary mood of the working masses, he said, "the ruling bourgeoisie is increasingly seeking salvation in fascism with the purpose of carrying out purely predatory measures against the working people, preparing for a piratical imperialist war ... and averting revolution".* German nazism, the main force of world reaction, the principal instigator of another imperialist war and the mortal enemy of the USSR, was coming forward as the mailed fist of the international counter-revolution.

Of fundamental significance was the conclusion, drawn by the Congress, that "fascism's accession to power is *not an ordinary replacement* of one bourgeois government by another, but the *replacement* of one state form of the class rule of the bourgeoisie (bourgeois democracy) by another—an openly terrorist dictatorship".** This lucid definition of the contradiction between fascism and bourgeois democracy gave the Communist Parties the key to understanding that developments had created the objective foundation for uniting different classes and strata against the common enemy—fascism.

Characterising fascism as basic regression compared with bourgeois democracy and as a monstrous offspring of capitalism, Dimitrov noted: "Today the fascist counter-revolution

* G. Dimitrov, *Selected Works*, Russ. ed., Vol. I, Gospolitizdat, Moscow, 1957, p. 375.

** Ibid., p. 378.

attacks bourgeois democracy in order to impose on the working people a regime of the most barbarous exploitation and suppression. In some capitalist countries the working masses have now to choose *concretely* not between the proletarian dictatorship and bourgeois democracy, but between bourgeois democracy and fascism.”*

Unity of all the revolutionary and democratic forces against fascism was the principal task set the Communists by the Seventh Congress. Here the united workers’ front had to play the chief role. Fascism could come to power, Dimitrov said, because the working class had found itself split in face of the bourgeois offensive. “*United action of the proletariat on the national and international levels,*” he pointed out, “*was the powerful weapon which gave the working class the ability not only to defend itself successfully but also go over to a successful counter-offensive against fascism, against the class enemy.*”**

Recording its appreciation of the latest experience of the Communist Parties of France, Spain and a number of other countries in the struggle for a united workers’ front, the Seventh Congress clearly indicated that such a front could be most successfully built up round anti-fascist, democratic demands. The defence of the direct economic and political interests of the working class and the defence of the proletariat against fascism, it was stated in the decisions of the Congress, had to be the point of departure and main content of the proletarian united front in all capitalist countries.*** This gave the united workers’ action policy a new content. Formerly it was linked with the task of winning the majority of the working class in direct preparation for the socialist revolution. Under the new modification its goal became the mass struggle against fascism and war with the enlistment of the masses into an active class struggle. Lenin’s teaching of a united workers’ front policy was thus enlarged on in the new situation.

Inasmuch as the establishment of a united workers’ front depended chiefly on the promotion of relations between the Communist and Social-Democratic Parties, the Congress

* Ibid., p. 468.

** Ibid., p. 394.

*** *Resolutions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International*, Russ. ed., Partizdat, Moscow, 1935, p. 15.

closely analysed the policies and position of the Social-Democratic movement. While pointing to the fatal consequences of the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie pursued by the Right wing of that movement, the Congress noted the considerable changes that had taken place in the stand of the Social-Democratic movement and the shift to the left on the part of its rank and file. As Dimitrov pointed out, the fascist suppression of workers' organisations, including Social-Democratic organisations, and the threat of fascist aggression against a number of countries made it difficult and in some countries impossible for the Social-Democratic Parties to pursue their former policy of class collaboration. In these Parties the Left groups were gaining strength and setting their sights on the revolutionary class struggle. The bitter lessons that were drawn from the victory of fascism in a number of countries induced the Social-Democratic workers to look for ways of successfully defending themselves against the fascists. Taking all the anti-fascist potentials of the Social-Democratic movement into account, the Communists had to work for united action with it and establish the closest possible contacts with its Left groups and trends.

The question of trade union unity was also raised in a new way, in line with the need for making the trade unions a strongpoint of the anti-fascist struggle. It was decided "to take all practical measures to secure the unity of the trade unions on the production and national levels", to fight "in each country and on a world scale for united class trade unions as one of the major bulwarks of the working class against the offensive of capitalism and fascism".* It was recommended that the large revolutionary trade unions should work for unity with the reformist unions, while the smaller unions were urged to integrate with the reformist trade unions. The Comintern was prepared to recognise the united trade unions' organisational independence of political parties, declaring that this independence did not imply political neutrality and that the Communists in the trade unions would work for the implementation of the class proletarian policy and chiefly for the active participation of the trade unions in the anti-fascist struggle.

* *Resolutions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International*, p. 21.

The Congress called for the cohesion of the trade union movement at all levels, including the integration of the two trade union Internationals.

The Congress examined the policy of proletarian unity as part of the task of establishing a broad inter-class alliance directed against fascism. In working on the popular front problems, the Communists adhered to Lenin's teaching that there had to be a close link between the struggle for democracy and the struggle for socialism, and that it was possible to form a broad alliance of forces in the struggle against imperialist reaction. The delegates to the Congress rejected the apprehension, voiced by some Communists in the 1930s, that the struggle for democracy would revive reformist illusions among the people and that, consequently, the class struggle would subside.

Accentuating the significance of Lenin's teaching of the link between the struggle for democracy and the movement for socialism, Dimitrov, in his report, recalled Lenin's words that it "would be a radical mistake to think that the struggle for democracy was capable of diverting the proletariat from the socialist revolution, or of hiding, overshadowing it, etc. On the contrary, in the same way as there can be no victorious socialism that does not practise full democracy, so the proletariat cannot prepare for its victory over the bourgeoisie without an all-round, consistent and revolutionary struggle for democracy".*

The Communists acted on the principle that the struggle against fascism, for broader democracy, could narrow down exploitation and capitalist power and that this struggle did not contradict but fully conformed to the class aspirations of the proletariat.

Stating that the defeat of fascism and the defence and extension of democracy were the cardinal aim of the given stage of the struggle, the Comintern named the way to unite all the forces capable of achieving this aim. This way was the popular front.

At the Seventh Congress it was stressed that the overwhelming majority of each country—the proletariat, the peasants, the urban petty bourgeoisie, the artisans and the intelligentsia—had to be brought together for united anti-fascist action. All of society's active forces capable of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 22, p. 144.

ensuring progressive development had to be concentrated in the popular front. The very logic of the struggle placed the working class in the centre of this front, because only under its leadership could the popular front give effect to determined anti-fascist action.

The popular front was more than a defensive inter-class alliance called on to uphold bourgeois-democratic freedoms and the rights of the working people against fascist attack. It was a major factor of social progress, a means of bringing the masses to the socialist revolution through the stage of democratic, anti-fascist struggle. This idea was most strikingly embodied in the formula for a popular front government advanced by the Seventh Congress. In substantiating this formula the Comintern drew upon the conclusions enunciated at the Third and Fourth Congresses with Lenin's participation.

It was stated that in all cases such a government had to undertake decisive measures undermining the might of monopoly capital, fascism and reaction and strengthening the position of the proletariat and all other working people.

In the report delivered by Dimitrov, in the speeches of other delegates and in the resolutions adopted by the Congress it was stated that the popular front government *might* be a form of transition to the proletarian dictatorship. It was up to political practice to show the conditions under which this possibility could be realised. Nonetheless, this thesis was of enormous political importance on both the theoretical and practical levels.

The Comintern drew the significant conclusion that the Communist Parties had to give popular front governments their utmost support. While moving democratic tasks to the forefront, the united workers' and anti-fascist popular front policy did not imply the shelving of the struggle for direct socialist aims.

At the Congress the popular front policy was examined in its relation to the struggle against the threat of a world war, for which nazi Germany, imperialist Japan and fascist Italy were preparing. At the Congress Palmiro Togliatti pointed out that with the encouragement of imperialist reaction of other countries the fascist aggressors were already moving towards war and preparing for a counter-revolutionary crusade against the USSR. In this connection

the Congress proclaimed the slogan of struggle for peace as the *central slogan* of the Communist Parties.* Peace, it was stated at the Congress, ensured the further progress of socialism in the USSR and the growth of that country's economic and political might. For the Communist Parties the struggle for peace opened broad possibilities for uniting all the anti-fascist forces and for rallying all the proletariat's allies interested in averting war. The Congress condemned the Trotskyite view that war cleared the way to revolution.

Under the new conditions, when the Soviet Union had become a great power and its peace-loving policy was exercising growing influence on the international situation, the struggle for peace, the Communists maintained, was not hopeless even at the grimmest moments; war could be delayed and, under certain conditions, averted altogether.

Of fundamental importance was the conclusion, drawn by the Congress, that national liberation wars were possible in Europe in a situation in which fascist aggression threatened not only the Soviet Union but also a number of small countries. Wilhelm Pieck declared at the Congress that in the event Hitler attacked Czechoslovakia the international proletariat had to help that country, because it considered the defence of Czechoslovakia a just cause. Recalling the words spoken by Lenin during the First World War about the possibility of national liberation wars breaking out in Europe, the Congress stressed that these words were doubly true in a situation witnessing the mounting aggressiveness of fascism, which was directly threatening many European countries. In the event the imperialists started a war against small countries the Communist Parties pledged to fight selflessly for national independence and wage a liberation war to the end, giving "their own" bourgeoisie no opportunity of coming to terms with the aggressor powers at the expense of the interests of their country. At the Congress the problem was raised of combining the struggle of the proletariat for national independence with the struggle for the class interests of the working people, and the task was set of evolving a flexible policy with regard to the defensive measures taken by the bourgeois

* *Resolutions of the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International*, p. 36.

governments, including the demand for the democratisation of social life as a whole.

In the Congress decisions it was stated that to preserve peace the smaller countries had to co-operate with the USSR. Furthermore, it was pointed out that co-operation was possible between the USSR and those capitalist states that at the given moment desired to preserve peace. The defence of the USSR, whose role in upholding socialism and peace throughout the world was enhanced by the great achievements of socialist construction, was regarded as one of the prime internationalist duties of Communists. The promotion of the struggle for peace, it was stressed at the Congress, was inseparable from the achievements of socialism and from the growth of the Soviet Union's strength.

* * *

The united workers' and popular front policy evolved by the Seventh Congress on the basis of a deep-going Marxist-Leninist analysis of reality and a study of the experience gained in the class battles throughout the world, gave the working people a reliable compass for many years ahead.

The new policy adopted by the Communists became a powerful lever promoting the struggle of the working class and all democrats against fascism and war. The period 1935-37 witnessed a considerable upsurge of the international working-class and democratic movement and the strengthening of united action of the proletariat and all anti-fascists. Having been given greater scope for initiative and independence by the decisions of the Seventh Congress, the Communist Parties began to win greater influence among the masses and become a major factor of the political life of their countries. The successes achieved by the Communists and all working people in France were particularly noteworthy.

Through its consistent and flexible policy the French Communist Party won most of the members of the Socialist and Radical Parties to the popular front. The united workers' front, which was the basis of the popular front, grew stronger. The General Confederation of Labour, with Communists in its leadership, was formed in 1936 through the integration of revolutionary and reformist trade unions.

Its membership grew to 5,000,000 from the original million members in the organisations of the two unions. The popular front's victory at the 1936 elections gave fresh impetus to the struggle of the working class, the peasants and the urban middle strata. In the summer of 1936 France was enveloped in a powerful strike movement, in the course of which demands were made for far-reaching socio-economic reforms. The working class secured a 40-hour working week, paid leaves, collective agreements protected by law, higher wages, and so on. Some of the pressing economic demands made by the peasants, artisans, small shopkeepers, office employees and intellectuals were also satisfied. These were unprecedented achievements under bourgeois rule.

In those years the popular front saved France from fascism. Closing its ranks, the French working class frustrated the plans and intrigues of the fascist forces.

By pursuing the popular front policy the French working class established itself as the leading force in the democratic struggle and as the nation's principal driving force. This policy furthered the growth of the Communist Party itself, giving it greater influence among the working people and strengthening its links with their mass organisations. In 1935-37 the Party's membership grew eight-fold.

The popular front benefited not only the Communists but all other democratic forces, all the working people. Exposing the lie that through the popular front the French Communist Party was out to "devour" the Socialist Party and benefit only itself, the Left Socialist Jean Zyromski wrote: "In our country the successful implementation of proletarian united action was the decisive factor in the victory of the two parties. The Socialist Party was not 'devoured' by the Communist Party as many people thought it would be. . . . United action benefited both parties . . . it brought victory to the working class."*

By adopting the line of united action with the Communist Party, the Socialist Party likewise won more influence among the people. Its membership grew from 120,000 in 1935 to 202,000 at the end of 1936.** Otto Bauer, a prominent Left-wing member of the Labour and Socialist International,

* *Der Kampf*, No. 6, 1936, p. 221.

** *Yearbook of the International Socialist Labour Movement, 1956-1957*, London, 1956, p. 205.

acknowledged the immense role played by the popular front as a mass movement in the struggle against reaction, and the importance of united action of the two workers' parties. He wrote: "Without the united action of Socialists and Communists the large mass movements springing from the victory of the popular front would never have been so purposeful and would not have ended successfully."*

In putting through and developing the popular front the French Communists had the constant political support of the Comintern, which gave its full approval to all their steps aimed at strengthening the unity of the workers, consolidating the popular front and carrying out its programme. The Comintern's recommendations helped the French Communists to achieve new successes in the anti-fascist unity policy. In February 1936 the Secretariat of the Comintern Executive examined the question of convening a unity congress of the French trade unions and endorsed the propositions of the reporter, Gaston Monmousseau, on the conditions for uniting the trade unions and on the future programme statement of the united French Confederation of Labour. The Secretariat rejected the view of some members of the Profintern that the policy of the French Communists was a concession to reformism, and that the intended programme statement was grist to the mill of the opportunists. Dimitrov, Manuilsky and Monmousseau stressed at the meeting of the Secretariat of the Comintern Executive that trade union unity was of the utmost importance for strengthening the united workers' and popular front but that there were many obstacles to be overcome. A programme satisfying only the supporters of a proletarian dictatorship would not facilitate trade union unity. Therefore, they said, the programme had to contain only the minimum conditions for mustering the working-class forces, drawing more thousands of unorganised workers into the trade unions and activating the entire organised proletariat in the struggle for democracy, peace and social progress.

In the mid-1930s there was a powerful upsurge of the working-class and democratic movement in Spain. The consistent policy followed by the Communist Party, whose membership increased from 30,000 to 102,000 in only the

* *Der Kampf*, No. 5, 1937, p. 170.

period from February to July 1936,* resulted in the formation of a popular front of workers' organisations and Left-republican parties. At the parliamentary elections in February 1936 the popular front inflicted a crushing defeat on the reactionary parties. After this the democratic revolution developed swiftly. However, fearing a further upswing of the revolution, the reactionary pro-fascist forces started an uprising in July 1936 and they soon received support from fascist powers—Germany and Italy. The largest battles against fascism on an international scale took place in Spain in those years. The struggle to unite all Republican forces against the insurgents and the German-Italian fascist intervention intertwined with a striving for far-reaching democratic reforms. A land reform was put into effect. The large factories were nationalised. Socio-political life was democratised.

The Communist Party of Spain operated in an exceedingly difficult situation. The wavering, indecision and inconsistency of the Socialists in countering the fascist uprising were a serious obstacle to the efforts to strengthen the popular front. Still greater harm was inflicted by the adventurism of the anarchist organisations, which concentrated chiefly on "deepening the revolution", on immediate "collectivisation" in the countryside and in the towns, and on the establishment of "free communism", i.e., a system conforming to the anarchist ideal. The adventurist experiments of the anarchists menaced the proletariat's alliance with the petty bourgeoisie of town and country, split the working class and gave rise to sharp differences in the popular front. In this complex situation the Communist Party, which had entered the new government headed by the Socialist Largo Caballero, perseveringly and patiently pursued the line of uniting all anti-fascists in order to defeat the insurgents and interventionists and carry out democratic reforms.

The Comintern assisted the Communist Party of Spain by sending cadres and helping it to grapple with the key problems of the struggle waged by the Spanish people. In September 1936 the Secretariat of the Comintern Executive considered the nature of the Spanish revolution and drew an extremely important conclusion, namely that the democratic republic for whose victory the Spanish people were

* *War and Revolution in Spain, 1936-1939*, Vol. I, p. 89.

fighting would not be the old type of democratic republic but a state with genuine democracy for the people. The conclusions on the *new type of democratic revolution and on a genuinely people's democratic state* underlay the basic policy pursued by the Communist Party of Spain to achieve the broadest possible alliance of the Republican forces and promote militant co-operation with the Socialists, the anarcho-syndicalists and Republicans with the purpose of defeating the insurgents and the interventionists.

These conclusions of the Comintern stemmed from the extremely important Leninist postulates that the multifor- mity of revolution could not be reduced to "the antithesis between bourgeois revolution and proletarian revolution",* and that the Communists of the Western countries had to "search after forms of the *transition* or the *approach* to the proletarian revolution".** Guided by these postulates the communist movement found and began to implement the approach to the struggle for socialism through the new type of democratic revolution and the activation of the mass movement for the new democracy.

The Presidium of the Comintern Executive deliberated the Spanish question in December 1936 and supported the Communist Party's line to secure the utmost strengthening of the popular front. It recommended making nationalisation dependent on the interests of the Republic's defence and confiscating enterprises belonging only to direct or indirect participants in the revolt. Moreover, it approved the transfer to the peasants of the land confiscated from fascist land- owners and endorsed the policy of protecting and ensuring the property rights and interests of small and medium prop- rietors and halting requisitioning from the working people of town and country. It denounced the attempts to collectivise the peasant farms as a policy that in the prevailing condi- tions could impede the popular front.***

When the situation was aggravated by the military suc- cesses of the insurgents and the interventionists, the Com- munist Party, acting on recommendations from the Com- intern, called for the unity of the nation's healthy forces and for an enlargement of the popular front. The declara-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 416.

** Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 92.

*** *Kommunistichesky International*, No. 1, 1937, p. 61.

tion of the Negrín Cabinet, known as the "13 points" and drawn up with the active participation of the Communist Party, was aimed at uniting all the Republican forces. Enlarging upon this policy, in the spring of 1938 the Communist Party proclaimed the slogan of "national unity for the salvation of Spain". In its policy it sought to give every attention to the interests of the petty bourgeoisie, demanded the strict observance of the freedom of conscience, suggested drawing the middle bourgeoisie into a national front and demanded an end to extremes in the confiscation of the property of the middle bourgeoisie and the restoration of the real estate and movable property confiscated from the petty and middle bourgeoisie.

In Spain, where national interests were jeopardised, the popular front began to turn into a national front. Although the Spanish Republic was defeated, important practical experience was gained by the popular front in that country. It showed there were new possibilities for advancing towards socialism and helped to elucidate the practical possibilities for mobilising the broadest sections of the people in a national front and turning this front into national unity against foreign aggression.

Under the slogans of a united workers' and popular front the Communist Parties of many other European countries redoubled their efforts to unite the masses against fascism and reaction. In 1935-37 the Communist Party of Poland headed large political strikes against the tyrannical regime. In its efforts to set up a popular front of labour, freedom and peace, the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia succeeded in winning the support of considerable segments of workers, intellectuals and small proprietors. The British Communists likewise stirred the working people to a struggle against the fascist movement. Determined militant action against fascist provocations and processions, in particular the action of the people of East London in October 1936 initiated by the Communist Party, dealt a telling blow at fascism in Britain. As a result of this blow the movement headed by the fascist Mosley declined. In 1937, with the political support of the Comintern Executive, the Communist Party of Great Britain together with the Independent Labour Party and the Socialist League conducted a campaign for the unity of the working-class movement and for a modification of the policy pursued by the Labour Party.

In Italy the Communist Party succeeded in strengthening unity with the Socialists. A new agreement on co-operation was concluded between these parties in 1937. The Communists and Socialists acted jointly to overthrow the fascist dictatorship and establish a democratic republic, which, they hoped, would solve the land problem, end monopoly rule and give the people guaranteed rights.* This laid the foundation for a broad anti-fascist movement in Italy.

The united workers' and anti-fascist popular front policy helped to enhance the influence of the Communist Party of the USA as well. In the course of a large-scale strike movement there was a marked shift to the left by the trade unions. A new trade union centre, the Congress of Industrial Organisations, emerged in the 1930s. With a membership exceeding 4,000,000 it adopted a more progressive stand. The popular movement forced the ruling circles to make important concessions in the sphere of social legislation. Steadily growing influence was enjoyed by the Communist Party, which in 1934 had nearly 25,000 members, and in 1939 almost 90,000 members. The working class began to carry increasing weight in progressive, democratic organisations.

The Communist Party of the USA started a drive for a broad popular front in the form of a workers' and farmers' party. In early 1937 it took a further important step in this direction by deciding not to limit the popular front to a workers' and farmers' party but draw Left-wing elements of the Democratic Party into the movement without demanding an organisational split and without renouncing criticism of their inconsistent actions.** The Comintern helped it to overcome Right-opportunist trends and the sectarian fear of united action with the petty-bourgeois masses.

William Z. Foster wrote the following about those years: "Although during the big drive against reaction in the 1930s the American working class won many concessions it did not succeed in the long overdue task of building a great labour, or labour-farmer party. There was a sharp increase of trade union political activity, especially in the CIO, but this did not reach the point of an actual break with the

* *The Communist International. A Short History*, Russ. ed. Politizdat, Moscow, 1969, p. 444.

** *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 9, 1937, pp. 24-25.

bourgeois political organisations, particularly not with the Democratic Party.”*

The Communist Parties had to contend with enormous difficulties in countries ruled by a fascist or semi-fascist regime, for example, in Germany, Italy, Austria, Greece, Hungary, Poland, Bulgaria and some other countries. Communists were imprisoned, brutally tortured and shot. But the Communist Parties, though exposed daily to risk, went on with their extensive work of uniting the anti-fascist forces and setting up popular front committees. A clearly defined aim, that of creating anti-fascist democratic republics, was the crucial factor of the popular front policy. With the popular front as their slogan the Communists sought to unite all opponents of the fascist regime of violence, murder and ruthless oppression.

Unquestionably, this policy would have been much more successful if the leaders of the Labour and Socialist International and of the majority of its parties had not gone on splitting the working class. While many Social-Democratic workers welcomed the Comintern's new policy and in some countries (France, Spain, Italy) the Socialist Parties joined the Communists in a united front, most of the leaders of the Labour and Socialist International declared that the line charted by the Seventh Congress was a “manoeuvre” and constituted fraudulent “new elastic tactics”.**

The enormous growth of the influence enjoyed by the Communist Party greatly worried the Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic movement. “Nobody must have any illusions,” a Right-Socialist journalist wrote, “about the fact that the initiative is wholly in the hands of the Communists. Where the ‘united front’ movement is growing rapidly, as, for example, in France, there is the danger that we Socialists will be moved aside and the leadership will pass entirely into the hands of the Communists.”*** They therefore began to increase their resistance to the united front. Even in France the leaders of the Socialist Party decided to capitulate to the big capitalists. As early as March 1937, the Socialist

* William Z. Foster, *Outline History of the World Trade Union Movement*, New York, 1956, p. 334.

** J. Braunthal, *Geschichte der Internationale*, Vol. II, Hannover, 1963, pp. 501-02.

*** *Zeitschrift für Sozialismus*, No. 24-25, 1935, pp. 790-91.

Léon Blum, who headed the government, proclaimed a "respite" in the implementation of the popular front policy.

The Comintern and the Communist Parties were in the vanguard of the struggle against the fascist warmongers. In the autumn of 1935, when fascist Italy was getting ready for aggression against Ethiopia, the Comintern wrote to the Secretariat of the Labour and Socialist International proposing prompt joint action to alert the working class, win the support of peace fighters from other classes and stay the hand of the Italian fascists. In October 1935, after the Italian aggression got under way, Georgi Dimitrov wrote another letter to the leadership of the Second International on behalf of the Comintern Executive, proposing talks between the two Internationals with the purpose of uniting all the forces of the proletariat and other working people and blocking the road to a world war. Although they kept talking about their opposition to war, the leaders of the Social-Democratic movement turned down joint united action with the Communists in defence of peace.

Bending every effort to mobilise the masses for the struggle against imperialist war, the Comintern and the Communist Parties sponsored large-scale international anti-war actions. A conference of representatives of the anti-war movement of Central and Southeastern Europe was held in Prague in July 1936. An international peace congress attended by 4,500 delegates from 35 countries was held in Brussels in September of the same year. At the congress the Communists did not insist on their own programme, believing that it was necessary to fight for aims acceptable to all peace fighters. The congress proclaimed a four-point programme: inviolability of treaties, reduction and limitation of armaments, collective security and the strengthening of the League of Nations, and the establishment within the League of Nations of an effective system to relax international tension and avert war. An international peace plebiscite was proposed.* This congress showed the growing unity of the forces opposing the imperialist aggressors, namely, Germany, Japan and Italy.

The Comintern and the Communist Parties warned the peoples of the countries neighbouring on Germany of the threat of nazi aggression. After the seizure of Austria, when

* *Rundschau*, No. 41, 1936, pp. 1711, 1714.

nazi Germany became a direct threat to Czechoslovakia's national independence, the Comintern and the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia called for a solid front of different classes and strata, including the patriotic section of the bourgeoisie, in order to save the republic's independence. The switch to the popular front policy against nazism prepared the foundations for the future Resistance movement.

The role played by the USSR as the mainstay of peace grew with the mounting threat of a world war. The fate of the world revolutionary movement now depended on the Soviet Union's might more than ever before. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Soviet people were aware of this great responsibility and stinted no effort to build socialist society and strengthen their country's defence capability.

Millions of people regard the struggle of the Comintern and the Communist Parties to unite all patriots against fascist aggression and the Soviet policy of creating a system of collective security as the only means of averting a world war. Left-wing Socialists and progressive intellectuals declared that a united front with the Communists and with the Soviet Union in international policy was not only vital but quite possible. "It is now a question of peace on earth and of freedom on the continent," Otto Bauer wrote bitterly in the summer of 1936. "Yet we are still unable to organise an anti-fascist united front against the fascist united front in order to save freedom and peace."* However, in their foreign policy most of the parties of the Labour and Socialist International continued to follow in the wake of their bourgeoisie.

The sharp difference between the stand of the Communist and the Socialist International strikingly manifested itself in the attitude towards the national-revolutionary war in Spain. The Comintern and the Communist Parties organised the anti-fascist campaign of solidarity with the Spanish Republic. In response to the Comintern's appeal, demonstrations and rallies in solidarity with the embattled Spanish people were held throughout the world. Responding to a call from the Communists volunteers poured from France, Italy, Germany, Poland, Hungary, Bulgaria, Belgium, the USA, Latin America and elsewhere. The volunteers were

* *Der Kampf*, No. 8, 1936, p. 304.

formed into international brigades in whose organisation and leadership a prominent role was played by Palmiro Togliatti, Luigi Longo, Victorio Codovilla, Mate Zalka, Hans Beimler, Karol Swierczewsky and many other leading Communists.

Extensive assistance was rendered to the Spanish Republic by the Soviet Union, which upheld the Republic's interests on the international level. Soviet working people sent to Spain scores of shiploads of food, medicaments and armaments. Soviet pilots, tankers, artillerymen, sailors and engineers fought in Spain.

Soon after the uprising in Spain broke out, the Comintern and the Communist Parties called on the Labour and Socialist International to join them in defending the Spanish Republic. But the leaders of that International refused to take this vital step. They limited their assistance to Republican Spain to food and the collection of funds. At a conference in London in March 1937 the Labour and Socialist International and the Amsterdam International only promised to "awaken world public opinion"* in reply to the appeals for weapons from the Spanish Republic. The Spanish Socialist Party walked out of the conference in protest against its decision.

An agreement on some joint actions in defence of the Spanish Republic was finally reached between the Comintern and the Labour and Socialist International in the summer of 1937. For the Right-wing Social-Democrats even this limited agreement proved to be unacceptable. Right-wing Social-Democrats in high government posts in a number of countries in effect opposed sanctions against the fascist aggressors in Spain.

During this period the Comintern and the Communist Parties encountered enormous difficulties. In 1938 it became obvious that after having been compelled to go over to the defensive for two or three years, imperialist reaction and fascism had once again started an offensive against the working-class and democratic movement. Right-wing Social-Democrats came out more and more openly against the united workers' and popular front, eroding the popular front in countries where it existed. On the international level the imperialists struck an anti-Soviet bargain which found

* *Bulletin des Internationalen Gewerkschaftsbundes*, No. 11, 1937, p. 4.

expression in the Munich agreement of September 1938. This agreement by four powers—Germany, Britain, France and Italy—turned Czechoslovakia over to the tender mercies of the fascist aggressors and encouraged them to attack the USSR. In a joint appeal, the Communist Parties of ten European countries, the USA and Canada stated that “the Munich betrayal has not saved peace, it has only jeopardised it, for it has hit the alliance of the peace forces in all countries and encouraged the fascists”.*

While the Comintern and the Communist Parties were mobilising the masses against the Munich policy, the Labour and Socialist International in effect ceased to exist as an international organisation. Following in the wake of their “own” bourgeoisie, its parties adopted the most diverse stands on international issues: some supported the Munich agreement, others came out against it, and still others preached neutrality. The refusal of the Social-Democratic leaders to join in a united front against war and fascism was one of the factors that allowed imperialist reaction to engage in full-scale preparations for war.

Some difficulties arose in the communist movement in connection with sectarian trends and accompanying negative phenomena in the Comintern as well.**

For a number of reasons (one of which was the alignment of socio-political forces in the world) the international working class was unable to prevent the most aggressive and reactionary groups of world imperialism from starting another world war. Fascism strangled the Spanish Republic. Reaction began an offensive in many countries.

However, the Comintern and its national sections had aligned the broad masses against fascism and armed advanced proletarians and democrats with experience of fighting the fascists.

LENINISM AND THE CONSOLIDATION OF THE UNITED ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT

Lenin's theory of the national-colonial problem is an outstanding example of scientific thinking moving from a theoretical conclusion to the question of the political conduct,

* *Kommunistisches International*, No. 10, 1938, p. 126.

** *Kommunist*, No. 5, 1969, pp. 9, 24.

strategy and tactics of the Communist vanguard. This teaching rests on the Marxist concept of the world revolutionary process and on the common interests of the principal torrents of this process.

Lenin held that the cardinal task of the Communists was to bring all the revolutionary forces into a united anti-imperialist front. He regarded a united front of the proletariat of the developed countries with the oppressed peoples, a front backed by the achievements of the world's first socialist country, as the guarantee of the future victory over imperialism. He wrote: "... the socialist revolution will not be solely, or chiefly, a struggle of the revolutionary proletarians in each country against their bourgeoisie—no, it will be a struggle of all the imperialist oppressed colonies and countries, of all dependent countries, against international imperialism."*

While attaching vital importance to the struggle of the imperialist-oppressed colonies and countries, Lenin emphatically rejected the arguments of those who considered that the destiny of the revolutionary movement in Europe depended entirely on the course of the revolution in the East. "Without the triumph of the revolution in the Eastern countries," said Roy, a young Indian delegate at the Second Congress of the Comintern, "the communist movement in the West may come to nothing. World capitalism draws its main resources and its incomes from the colonies, chiefly in Asia. In the last resort the European capitalists may give the workers the entire surplus value and thereby win them over, killing their revolutionary aspirations. The capitalists will, for their part, continue the exploitation of Asia with the assistance of the proletariat. Such an outcome would be a great boon for the capitalists. In this light it is imperative to transfer energy to raise and promote the revolutionary movement in the East and adopt as the main thesis the fact that the destiny of world communism depends on the triumph of communism in the East."** Roy thus argued that the exploitation of colonies was giving imperialism the possibility of turning the proletariat of the West—the entire proletariat and not just a substratum of workers' aristocrats—

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 159.

** *Proceedings of the Second Congress of the Communist International*, Russ. ed., No. 1, 1920, pp. 1-2.

into an ally. The proletariat and all other working people of the East were thereby set apart from their ally—the working class of the capitalist West. On the basis of this mistaken premise he drew the conclusion that the destiny of the West depended exclusively on the development and strength of the revolutionary movement in the Eastern countries.

Lenin's approach to this question was different. He did not regard the struggle against imperialism chiefly as "Western" or chiefly as "Eastern". It was, he said, an integral world revolutionary process with the working class forming the vanguard. He said that the political awakening of the oppressed peoples of the East and the opening of an "Eastern route" for the world revolution were of tremendous importance, but, at the same time, he saw the danger that this might be proclaimed the only route. He criticised the arguments advanced by Roy, who went "much too far" in his assessment of the revolutionary movement in the Asian countries.*

The infantile disorder of "Leftism"—which was a series of views in fact rejecting the possibility of a united front—became widespread in the young communist movement. Referring to the experience of the Bolshevik Party, the "Lefts", particularly in the East, drew attention mainly to the fact that in Russia the liberal bourgeoisie had turned into an openly counter-revolutionary force and that in that country democratic reforms became possible only as a result of the victory of the socialist revolution.

Lenin was categorically against the mechanical application of the tactics that were employed by the Bolshevik Party, which had operated in a politically independent country where capitalism had reached a medium level of development, to oppressed Eastern countries whose economic and political development was on an incomparably lower level. Lenin's book *"Left-Wing" Communism—an Infantile Disorder* warned against any one-sided study and utilisation of the Bolshevik Party's experience. Of particular importance to the Communists of the East was, as Lenin pointed out, the fact that in the situation then obtaining in Russia the Bolsheviks had not turned down the support of the liberal bourgeoisie against tsarism although at the same time they

* Ibid., p. 2.

had waged an uncompromising ideological and political struggle against bourgeois liberalism and against every manifestation of its influence in the working-class movement. Some months later, addressing the Communists of the East at the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin said: "In Russia we supported the liberal liberation movement during the assault on tsarism. The Indian Communists should support the bourgeois-democratic movement without merging with it."*

In the East the Comintern and the Communist Parties could most effectively help to set up a united anti-imperialist front through co-operation with the bourgeois-democratic forces on condition the Communist elements retained their independence. In the theses of the Second Congress, the substitution of the term "national-revolutionary" for "bourgeois-democratic" in reference to these forces was a further development of this tenet. Speaking of the capitulationist stand of a section of the bourgeoisie in the oppressed countries, Lenin considered that a really revolutionary spirit on the part of the non-proletarian forces whom the Communists would support was an indispensable condition for an alliance of the Communists with the bourgeois-democratic liberation movements. This step, he stressed, should be taken only when "their (these movements—*Authors.*) exponents do not hinder our work of educating and organising in a revolutionary spirit the peasantry and the masses of the exploited".**

Of great theoretical and practical importance was Lenin's tenet that the epoch of socialist revolutions had opened for the national liberation movement a real possibility of starting revolutionary action jointly with the countries where the proletariat had triumphed and with the working-class movement and Communist Parties of the capitalist countries.

Lenin's call for support for the bourgeois-democratic liberation movements in the oppressed countries was opposed by those who believed that the revolutionary potential of the national liberation movement had been exhausted. There were fundamental errors, for instance, in the remarks to the "Preliminary Draft Theses on the National and the Colonial Questions" received by Lenin in June 1920 from

* *Proceedings of the Second Congress of the Communist International*, Russ. ed., No. 1, 1920, p. 2.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 242.

Y. Preobrazhensky. Using Trotskyite views as his point of departure, Preobrazhensky asserted that "it would be wrong to overrate the revolutionary significance of the national uprisings in the colonies", arguing that the national liberation movement of the oppressed people was devoid of a revolutionary prospect. "The trade bourgeoisie and the intellectual upper crust" in the economically backward countries, he wrote, "inevitably seek to resolve the national question approximately in the same manner as it was raised in the epoch of the formation of national-bourgeois states and thereby . . . are turning into representatives of degenerating nationalism fated to die without first preparing grave-diggers from among their own people."

The practical conclusions that Preobrazhensky drew from these arguments were, naturally, injurious to the cause of forming a united anti-imperialist front. They boiled down to the following: the proletariat of the Soviet republics would have to act as the "grave-digger of nationalism" in the backward countries; "if the possibility of an economic agreement with the leading national groups is excluded, they will inevitably have to be suppressed by force and the economically important regions will have to be forcibly joined to the Union of European Republics for as long as the working lower classes liberated from their bourgeois upper crust do not produce groups capable of taking over power on the basis of a federation with Europe".

Lenin and the Comintern rejected views of this kind and suggested taking into account the conditions obtaining in the "revolutionary and nationalistic East", directing the liberation struggle of the oppressed peoples into the anti-imperialist channel and giving it a more determined character.

Lenin was emphatically against any attempt to give the bourgeois-democratic liberation trends the hue of communism. With Lenin's tenets as its guideline, the Comintern considered that one of the major tasks of the Communists in the drive to create an anti-imperialist front was to set up national-revolutionary mass non-Party organisations. Lenin held that this was a duty of the Communist Parties and of the elements prepared to set up these parties, and insisted on Communists tackling this task without delay.*

* *Kommunist*, No. 5, 1968, pp. 39, 46-47.

It was not expected that the "Communist cells" in the "non-Party" national-revolutionary organisations would turn them into communist organisations; the aim was to revolutionise these organisations by strengthening the Communist vanguard.

Lenin considered that the Communists of the East were faced with the same task as was carried out by the Bolshevik Party when it rallied the country's population round the proletariat of Russia. They had to unite the working masses of the backward countries round the world proletariat for the struggle against imperialism and medieval oppression. At the Third Congress of the Comintern Lenin said: "Much inflammable material has accumulated in capitalist countries which up to now have been regarded merely as the objects and not as the subjects of history, i.e., the colonies and semi-colonies. It is quite possible, therefore, that insurrections, great battles and revolutions may break out there sooner or later, and very suddenly too."* Developing this proposition, the Congress recorded in the theses "The World Situation and Our Tasks": "The revolutionary popular movement in India and other colonies is today as much part of the world revolution of the working people as the uprising of the proletariat in the capitalist countries of the Old and the New world."**

Lenin's contribution to the theory of national-colonial revolutions resulted in the framing of a single political line of the international communist movement. The policy of a united workers' front in the West and the line towards a united anti-imperialist front in the East were closely inter-related and supplemented each other.

A new stage of the development of the world revolutionary movement commenced at the beginning of the 1920s. The tide of revolution began to ebb in the capitalist countries. At the same time "the incredible has happened: a socialist republic in capitalist encirclement. The road of the international revolution is longer and more tortuous, but it is a *sure road* otherwise we should not have had what we have (a socialist republic in capitalist encirclement)."

In view of the decline of the revolutionary movement, the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, pp. 478-79.

** *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 173.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 5th Russ. ed., Vol. 44, p. 484.

Communist Parties had to activate the struggle to win the masses. Lenin's teaching of the united front, the struggle for whose consolidation went through numerous stages in the international communist movement, had become so much a part of life that Zinoviev and other sectarians were compelled to portray as a "further development" of this theory their attempt to bring the Comintern round to renouncing it.

The principles underlying the development of the liberation movement of peoples oppressed by imperialism became part and parcel of Lenin's general plan of the world revolutionary process. A magnificent example of this intrinsic unity was demonstrated by the Fourth Congress of the Communist International, at which the slogan of a united workers' front in the West was considered and elaborated on in close connection with the united anti-imperialist front policy in the East. These were different aspects of one and the same policy through whose implementation the hegemony of the proletariat and the leading role of the Communist Parties could be achieved by a persevering, day-to-day struggle within the framework of a united front but not as a preliminary condition of the establishment of such a front.

Amplifying on Lenin's teaching, the Fourth Congress adopted a document of historic importance entitled *The Eastern Problem. Theses*, which gave concrete shape to the united front principle as applied to colonial and semi-colonial countries. In the *Theses* it was noted that since the Second Congress of the Comintern "the struggle against imperialist oppression in the colonial and semi-colonial countries has greatly intensified on the basis of the deepening post-war political and economic crisis of imperialism". The Congress drew attention to the growth of the national liberation movement in India, Mesopotamia, Egypt, Morocco, China and Korea and stressed that it was important that Communist Parties should be founded in the Eastern countries. "Being clearly aware that under different historical conditions the most diverse elements may be the exponents of the will of a nation for state independence," this document stated, "the Communist International supports every national-revolutionary movement against imperialism. At the same time, however, it does not lose sight of the fact that the oppressed masses can be led to victory only by a consistently revolutionary policy aimed at drawing the

broadest masses into the active struggle and through an unconditional rupture with all exponents of conciliation with imperialism in the interests of their own class rule." The Congress drew the conclusion that the Communist Parties of the East, "which are more or less embryonic, should take part in every movement giving them access to the masses"; that the working class of the colonies and semi-colonies could assume the role of revolutionary leader provided it waged a consistent struggle against imperialism; and that the political organisation of the working class gave this struggle an increasingly revolutionary slant. "Refusal on the part of the Communists of the colonies to join in the struggle against imperialist violence on the pretext of 'upholding' independent class interests is opportunism of the worst kind which can only discredit the proletarian revolution in the East. It must be recognised that the attempts to evade the struggle for the vital, day-to-day interests of the working class for the sake of 'national unity' or 'civil peace' with the bourgeois democrats are similarly harmful."

Attention was drawn to the fact that the struggle for a united anti-imperialist front would help to "expose the wavering and vacillation of individual groups of bourgeois nationalists" in the event the working-class movement in the Eastern countries, after having become an "independent revolutionary factor in the common anti-imperialist front", most resolutely fought "for the utmost democratisation of the political regime in order to deprive the most politically and socially reactionary elements of support in the country and ensure freedom to the organisations of the working people for a struggle for their class interests".*

The *Theses* adopted by the Fourth Congress thus clearly defined the close link between the class and national tasks of the proletariat in the oppressed countries.

In those years the Comintern helped the newly founded Communist Parties of the East to surmount sectarian tendencies. Very indicative in this respect was the attitude of the Comintern Executive towards the communist and national liberation movements in Indonesia and China. It repeatedly declared that the Communists of Indonesia should work in revolutionary-nationalistic organisations and take steps to establish understanding with the leadership of these organ-

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, pp. 317-25.

isations. In September 1925 the Comintern received a letter from the leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia clearly showing that it was underrating the importance of work in non-proletarian revolutionary mass organisations. The Comintern Executive's reply stated that the leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia was making a sectarian error and called on the Party to support the national-revolutionary forces, particularly the peasants.

The Comintern had direct contact with the Kuomintang, which was still a national-revolutionary organisation at the time, and with its leader Sun Yat-sen. The recommendations on programme, tactical and organisational questions which the Comintern Executive gave Sun Yat-sen and other Chinese revolutionary democrats, who displayed an interest in the world's first state of the working people, helped to radicalise the Kuomintang, strengthen its Left wing and turn it into a mass organisation.

In pressing for the creation of national-revolutionary and workers' and peasants' parties in the Eastern countries, the Comintern Executive under no circumstances suggested that they should supplant the Communist Parties and did not consider that the predominantly worker and peasant composition of the national-revolutionary parties was a guarantee that their leadership would pursue a policy in the interests of workers and peasants. It was a question of mass organisations in which the Communists and bourgeois elements would fight for predominant influence.

The policy adopted by the Communist Party of China of encouraging Communists to join the Kuomintang individually and fight to consolidate and enlarge its Left wing stemmed directly from the recommendations of the Comintern and was a concrete application of the slogan "To the masses!" originally adopted for European conditions, and of the line aimed at setting up Communist cells in mass organisations.

These tactics mirrored the striving of the Comintern to get closer to the masses—workers, non-proletarian strata (chiefly peasants), and the oppressed peoples who had embarked on a struggle for liberation—using the means worked out by Lenin and the Bolshevik Party. "When I pick up a French newspaper," Lenin said at a sitting of the Comintern Executive in June 1921, "I am most of all amazed by the word *yacheika* (cell). I don't think you'll find this word in any dictionary because it is a purely Russian word; it was

coined during our long struggle with tsarism, the Mensheviks, opportunism and the bourgeois-democratic republic. This form of organisation was created by the experience of our struggle. It is the *yacheiki* that carry on collective work in parliamentary groups, in the trade unions and in the other organisations where they exist.”* Lenin attached an extended meaning to this word, having in mind Communist groups of various size operating in organisations enjoying the support of the masses.

The Comintern’s decisions on the Chinese question, its help in reorganising the Kuomintang into a mass national party and the Soviet Union’s support for the national government of China were in line with Lenin’s policy of securing an alliance with the national-revolutionary movement and forming a united anti-imperialist front. The Kuomintang, whose Left elements were led by the Communists, became a party of the anti-imperialist bloc in China. In this specific “multi-class” party a struggle for leadership flared up between the revolutionary elements, on the one side, and the bourgeoisie and warlords, on the other. The Kuomintang’s conversion into a national party—a process that was actively fostered by the Comintern—stirred the masses of China and was a major factor in preparing the revolution.

The first experience of political action in the East showed the Comintern and its sections that Lenin’s united anti-imperialist front line was both promising and fruitful. This explains why at the Fifth Congress (June-July 1924) the

* The significance Lenin attached to cells concerned the general methods of implementing the united front tactics, which are most fully dealt with in his book *“Left-Wing” Communism—an Infantile Disorder* and expressed in the formula “*work wherever the masses are to be found*” (*Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 53). The “Eastern” designation of this formula was, first and foremost, that the Communists should work in mass non-communist, national-revolutionary organisations—for instance, Sarekat Islam (Indonesia) and the Kuomintang (China). In other words, the united front tactics were not “trade union” or “parliamentary”, “Western” or “Eastern” tactics, and they were not tactics “for a decline” or “for an upsurge”, for “the seizure of power” or for the “revolutionisation of the masses”. Properly speaking, they were a Marxist-Leninist method of struggle for influence among the people. In every specific case the task of this method depended on the strategic aims of the given stage of the revolutionary process determined by the Communists not arbitrarily and not with the aim of “bringing matters to a head”, but on the basis of a scientific analysis of the situation and, chiefly, of the interests of the masses.

Leninist nucleus in the leadership of the Comintern succeeded in repulsing the pressure of the "Lefts" in the national-colonial question and rejecting Roy's sectarian proposals, whose untenability had been laid bare by Lenin at the Second Congress. According to the dogmatists, the sequence of events was: capitalism develops in the colonies and semi-colonies; a working class and its Party emerge; the local bourgeoisie forms an alliance with imperialism and feudalism because more than anything else it fears the growth of the revolutionary working-class movement; the non-proletarian democratic strata, inasmuch as they have not yet aligned themselves with the Communists, cannot wage a determined struggle against imperialism; national liberation will therefore be achieved only as a result of the Communist Party coming to power; all these processes will take place within a short period; the country where the proletariat has triumphed must give its support in the East exclusively to the Communist Parties, which appear there as leaders of the popular movements.

These views fitted in with the revolutionary impatience of the "Lefts", who blindly used concrete conclusions that had justified themselves in other conditions and circumstances.

The Executive Committee of the Comintern submitted a draft resolution on the national and Eastern problems to the Fifth Congress. The most important propositions in this draft were: the Comintern recognised that all forms of the anti-imperialist struggle had to be supported; the course of events showed that the Comintern was justified in its orientation on a link-up between the proletarian and national liberation movements; in the oppressed countries the task of the Communist Parties was to work for a united anti-imperialist front with the participation of the working class, the peasants and revolutionary elements among the bourgeoisie and intellectuals, and make every effort to help promote co-operation between the national governments of their countries and the USSR; the proletariat was interested in the consistent implementation of democratic reforms; therefore, working-class support for the national-revolutionary bourgeoisie depended on how far this bourgeoisie was determined to fight for the country's political independence, the abolition of economic enslavement and the consummation of the democratic revolution; the Communists had to make the

proletariat aware of itself as a class; they could become leaders of the working class only in struggle for the proletariat's day-to-day requirements; they had to prevent the young and small communist organisations from being dissolved in the general torrent of the national liberation movement; while acting in alliance with national-revolutionary forces, the Communists had to make every effort to eradicate nationalism in their own Parties.

The draft resolution called on the Communist Parties of the colonial and semi-colonial countries to work among the peasants in order to win their support and draw them into the national revolution not only by advancing independence slogans but also by backing their specific demands. It was suggested that steps should be instituted to form large workers' and peasants' or popular revolutionary organisations (or parties) while at the same time strengthening the Communist Parties ideologically and organisationally and consolidating their independence. Lastly, the Communist Parties of the metropolitan countries were charged with the duty of demanding the right to self-determination for the colonies; explaining to the workers of their countries that the liberation of the colonial peoples fully conformed to proletarian class interests; and demanding the legalisation of the working-class and communist movement in the colonies.*

The draft resolution on the national and Eastern questions was not passed by the Fifth Congress. It was felt that it would be more expedient to postpone the discussion of these issues to the next congress.

However, developments demanded urgent guidelines and recommendations on the tasks of the Communist Parties in the Eastern countries. The national and colonial questions were deliberated at the 5th extended plenary meeting of the Comintern Executive (March-April 1925). On April 6 the plenary meeting passed a resolution in which it assessed the political situation in India, Indonesia and Egypt and offered the Communists of these countries recommendations on programme and tactical problems.

The Comintern Executive's point of departure was that the national liberation movement was on the upswing. It

* For details of the struggle that raged round the draft resolution on the national and Eastern questions at the Congress see *The Comintern and the East*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1969, pp. 138-40.

was noted that at the given stage no situation existed for a direct armed struggle for the establishment of the power of the workers and peasants. The Comintern Executive did not consider—this point must be stressed—that the relative development of the national bourgeoisie (in India, for example) or, conversely, the practical absence of such a bourgeoisie was an obstacle to national independence. In evolving the most expedient tactics the Comintern Executive first and foremost ascertained what class was heading the national liberation struggle in the given country. This struggle could be revolutionary or reformist, massive or mostly at the top depending on the conditions and, above all, on the class character of the leadership. In order to influence the historical process most effectively, the headquarters of the world communist movement worked out the specific forms of this influence.

To begin with, the Comintern Executive advised the Communist Parties of the oppressed countries to strengthen their proletarian basis, uphold the independence of the proletarian movement and defend the interests of the working class. Attention was drawn to the far-reaching possibilities that loom for the Communist Parties when they are active in the national liberation struggle, because this was the only policy creating the prerequisites for the transfer of the leadership of the mass movement into the hands of the more determined anti-imperialist forces and, ultimately, of the Communist Parties.

Amplifying on the propositions moved at the Second Congress of the Comintern, the Executive Committee recommended the formation of “popular-revolutionary”, “popular” and “workers’ and peasants’” parties and called on the Communists of the East to be active in these parties while retaining their political independence. The aim was formulated lucidly: the bloc parties were to be turned into political organisations of the anti-imperialist front. There was no intention whatever of making these parties Communist or seizing the leadership in them.

Here again the Comintern’s policy towards the liberation and communist movement in China served as the model for its tactics in the national and colonial questions (this time in the mid-1920s).

In 1925-27 the Comintern devoted particular attention to the problems of the Chinese revolution. Its guideline in

this issue was most fully mirrored by the decisions of the 7th extended (November-December 1926) and 8th (May 1927) plenary meetings of the Executive Committee. This guideline was violently attacked by the Trotsky-Zinoviev opposition, which used the problems of the Chinese revolution to challenge the general line followed by the Comintern and the CPSU(B). Zinoviev and Trotsky maintained that for its motive forces, trends and rate of development the revolution in China did not differ from the Russian revolution of 1905. From this they concluded that the development of the bourgeois-democratic revolution—even if it did not complete its mission—into a socialist revolution had to be accelerated. They ignored the political immaturity of the Chinese proletariat and the national liberation, anti-imperialist nature of the revolution. In practice this meant ignoring the revolutionary potential of the national bourgeoisie. Without considering the real role played by the non-proletarian forces in the liberation movement in China, the opposition maintained that the developing bourgeois democratic revolution would “either win under the leadership of the working class or not win at all”.

They suggested dropping the concept “non-capitalist road”, holding that it meant nothing. They thus sought to nullify the decisions of the Second Congress of the Comintern, in which it was stated that the cardinal task in the East was to set up non-communist revolutionary organisations of the working people as a condition for the transition to non-capitalist development. In Sun Yat-senism, which Stalin characterised as “China’s preparation for Marxism”, the opposition saw “Chinese Populism plus nationalism plus Constitutional-Democratism”*. They reduced the most burning issues of the political situation in China in the 1920s to the formula “*either Marxism or Sun Yat-senism*”. They qualified the Comintern’s line aimed at securing an alliance of all the anti-imperialist forces in China as a “renunciation of Marxism” (which dovetails with the spirit of the present Social-Democratic critics of Leninism, who likewise regard Lenin’s fundamental proposition on a united anti-imperialist front as running counter to Marxism).

The opposition’s platform was an Eastern variant of the

* Views propounded by the Constitutional-Democratic Party, the leading party of the Russian liberal-monarchist bourgeoisie.—Ed.

Trotskyite theory of "permanent revolution" with its postulate that for all countries the common rule is to "leap" over the unconsummated bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution.

In accordance with this misrepresentation of the nature and motive forces of the Chinese revolution, the opposition attempted to impose tactics that were wrong at the time. These tactics were: the Communist Party's rupture with the Kuomintang and the formation of Soviets throughout the country as the "best form of working-class leadership of the entire national liberation movement of China" at the democratic stage of the revolution's development. Even more adventurist was the opposition's insistence that the agrarian revolution should be accelerated in the Chinese countryside. Implementation of these tactics would have been tantamount to driving a wedge between the peasant movement, which, as a rule, unfolded with the arrival of the Kuomintang's national revolutionary army in one province or another, and the armed force of the revolution. The opposition demanded the confiscation of large and medium Chinese-owned factories, relegating the confiscation of foreign-owned factories to the distant future. The opposition's leaders adopted the same attitude to the Left-wing leaders of the Kuomintang as to the Left-wing leaders of the General Council of the British trade unions, whom Trotsky and Zinoviev called the principal enemies of the British working-class movement.

They contended that the same strategy and tactics should be used against imperialism as were used against the autocracy. This strikingly demonstrated the anti-Leninist substance of the tactics which they wanted the international communist movement to adopt and also their scorn for the people's political experience.

After Chiang Kai-shek pulled off an anti-communist counter-revolutionary coup in April 1927, breaking with the camp of the national revolution, the opposition argued that the Kuomintang Right wing would not stay in power long. The working class, they said, would "mount a new offensive" a "month earlier or a month later" and, therefore, all who were against the slogan of Soviets should be expelled from the Left Kuomintang government in Wuhan. Actually, this was tantamount to demanding the transfer of all power to the Communist Party.

In its decision of May 7, 1927 on Zinoviev's theses on the Chinese question, the Central Committee of the CPSU(B) recorded: "What does the call for the formation of Soviets of *workers*', peasants' and soldiers' deputies throughout China now mean? It means a *direct* transition from the present *bourgeois* type of state organisation to the new, *proletarian* type of state organisation in present-day China. It means calling for the immediate transition to the dictatorship of the *proletariat* today, when the revolutionary dictatorship of the *proletariat and the peasantry* has yet to be won and probably will not be won soon. It means proclaiming the present revolution in China a *socialist* revolution today when the *bourgeois-democratic* revolution in China is only in its initial stage of development."

In other words, the opposition suggested a programme for the defeat of the revolutionary movement in China, for any attempt to carry it out would have brought about the immediate rout of the Communist Party and the Chinese revolution would have at once become a revolution of a handful of people at the top without reaching the mass stage.

The Comintern rejected the arguments of the opposition, correctly considering that before the Chiang Kai-shek coup the revolution had been national. At the time it did not see any grounds for considering the Kuomintang a conventional bourgeois party or a usual political party generally, regarding it as a broad organisation in which a struggle raged between heterogeneous class-political forces. Subsequently, after the Chiang Kai-shek coup, the Comintern correctly explained that the success of that coup was due to the strength of the enemy and not to erroneous tactics by the Communist Party, as the opposition tried to make out, nor to the Comintern's "excessive trust in Chiang Kai-shek". The Comintern Executive knew that Chiang Kai-shek would sooner or later strike at China's revolutionary forces. However, it was necessary to gain time in order to draw broader masses of people into the revolutionary movement, strengthen the Communist Party and prepare for resistance to the counter-revolution.

In the period when the Kuomintang acted in alliance with the Communist Party, its leadership, particularly, the Left wing of that leadership, took every opportunity to stress that the "Kuomintang had to maintain the closest possible contact

with the general headquarters of the world revolution", that "the leadership of the Comintern was indispensable to it" and "that its greatest desire was to have closer relations with the Comintern". In a conversation with a Comintern representative at the close of 1925 Hu Han-min, a Kuomintang representative, said: "Ultimately the Kuomintang will have to merge with the Communist Party of China. Perhaps this cannot be accomplished under present-day conditions, but it is only a question of time." He declared that the Kuomintang was necessary only until the tasks of national liberation were carried out. The Kuomintang Executive Committee went so far as to state its desire to join the Comintern, but this move was turned down by the Comintern, which correctly assessed it as a manoeuvre to give the nationalistic movement a communist façade.

Matters were naturally complicated by the fact that with the development of the revolution and the growth of the Communist Party's influence and strength, the strategy evolved by the Comintern and the Communist Party of China for the further deepening of the revolution endangered the position of the bourgeoisified Right-wing Kuomintang military-bureaucratic ruling clique, which had consolidated itself in the leadership. The people's faith in the Kuomintang, which had only recently been a revolutionary organisation, and control of the national army gave Chiang Kai-shek a clear preponderance of strength. In this situation no matter what tactics were employed, they could not achieve a prematurely set strategic aim. They would only have given more scope for the counter-revolution without bringing the Communist Party any closer to power.*

For the first time in its history the international communist movement found itself confronted with a situation in which a Communist Party that was rapidly growing numerically

* In March 1927 the Communist Party of China had nearly 58,000 members, of whom 53.8 per cent were workers, 18.7 per cent peasants, 19.1 per cent intellectuals and 3.1 per cent military. Under its influence were trade unions uniting large numbers of workers and numerous peasant unions. While the opposition believed this was "grounds" for pushing the Communist Party into an attempt to seize power independently, the Comintern felt that in the obtaining situation the Communists had to wage the struggle for power as part of the united front. In other words, the Comintern and the opposition adopted antipodal views on the tactical problems of the Chinese revolution.

and winning increasing influence was emerging onto the proscenium of the developing national liberation revolution. For the first time it was posed with the problem of correctly balancing the national and class factors in the anti-imperialist revolution. In many respects the Comintern resolved this problem correctly, rejecting the absolutely hopeless tactics proposed by the opposition.

At its 9th plenary meeting (February 9-25, 1928) the Comintern Executive scrutinised the situation in China after the defeat of the revolution. It was put on record that the first wave of the broad revolutionary movement of workers and peasants had suffered an overwhelming defeat and "at present there is still no sign of a new powerful upsurge of the mass revolutionary movement on a national scale".* Stressing that the bourgeois-democratic revolution had not resolved its economic, class or national tasks, the Comintern warned against premature assessments of the Chinese revolution as having grown into a socialist revolution. The plenary meeting noted: "This error is all the more harmful in view of the fact that it rules out a salient feature, namely, that the Chinese revolution is a semi-colonial revolution."***

Furthermore, the plenary meeting noted that the revolutionary movement in China was unfolding very unevenly. "The present moment is characterised by, among other things, the fact that in some provinces the *peasant* movement is unfolding further, while in the industrial centres the *working-class* movement, bled white and held in the vice of unprecedented White terror, is experiencing a stage of depression."*** Thus, in early 1928 the Comintern noted an extremely important feature of the Chinese revolution, which in subsequent years largely determined its development.

The Comintern held that the principal task of the Chinese Communists during this period was to enlist the support of millions of workers and peasants, educate them politically, organise them round the Party and its slogans and direct their day-to-day struggle. The Communist Party, it pointed out, had to work in the Kuomintang-influenced trade unions. It recommended that in the sovietised peasant areas the Communist Party should carry out an agrarian reform and

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 764.

** Ibid., p. 763.

*** Ibid., p. 764.

organise units of the Red Army in order subsequently to unite them "in a single All-China Red Army". The Communist Party of China was thus oriented toward "general co-ordinated actions in the countryside and the towns". Its slogans demanded the confiscation of the landed estates, the institution of an eight-hour working day, the unification of China and her liberation from the yoke of imperialism, the overthrow of Kuomintang rule, the establishment of the dictatorship of the proletariat and the peasantry, and the organisation of Soviets. The line aimed at setting up Soviets as organs of the revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the proletariat and peasantry was recommended by the Comintern in a new situation. As a result of the betrayal by the Kuomintang leadership and the defeat of the revolution of 1925-27, the situation in China did not allow for the creation of a broad anti-imperialist national front. "The Chinese revolution is at present suffering a crisis," Dmitry Manuilsky said in July 1927. "In the towns the Communists are being annihilated en masse. But we know that in the countryside, remote from the centres, it is much easier to work, and scores of possibilities obtain there. But when, on the one hand, Communists are being annihilated in the towns and, on the other, the peasant movement is growing, we have to work out ways to avoid isolation and create real conditions for the hegemony of the proletariat over the peasantry." As a result of the Chiang Kai-shek terror the most active section of the Chinese working class was wiped out. The terror was directed primarily at the Communist Party.

The Comintern attached enormous significance to the growing peasant movement in China and saw its colossal prospects. All the more did it feel that the Communists had to ensure the proletariat's leadership of the peasant masses. Without closing the door of the Communist Party of China to the peasants, the Comintern insisted that the Party's working-class character had to be ensured by strengthening and enlarging its proletarian nucleus, which determined its policy and the ideology of its rank and file. While being opposed to giving the bourgeois-democratic movement a communist hue, the Comintern was dead set against "working-class sectarianism" in a peasant country. This sectarianism was a feature of Trotskyism, which categorically refused to accord an independent political

role to non-proletarian strata in a socially and economically backward country.

The defeat of the Chinese Communist Party as a result of the reactionary coup led by Chiang Kai-shek gave no grounds for the conclusion that the non-proletarian forces of China (or of the entire East) had exhausted their revolutionary potentialities and that the anti-imperialist united front tactics belonged to the past. This conclusion was not offered by the Comintern at the time.* It is important to emphasise, for example, that the years 1927 and 1928 were a period that witnessed the most intensive activity by the Anti-Imperialist League (1927-35), which was the first large anti-imperialist organisation of the international working class, progressive intellectuals of the capitalist countries and representatives of the peoples of the colonial and dependent countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America. The Comintern supported the League in every possible way, regarding it an organisation of a united front of various anti-imperialist forces. "What basis must this League have?" Dmitry Manuilsky said in July 1928. "Obviously, if we had built up this League solely on the basis of the Communist Parties it would have been a second edition of the Comintern. This had to be avoided.... At present we have no need for a second edition of the Communist International. Our task today is to have a broader basis, chiefly among the colonial peoples. What has happened? There we had a deviation represented by Roy which boiled down to Roy having tried to narrow the basis to such proportions that there would have been a second edition of the Comintern."

The increased rate and achievements of socialist construction in the USSR, the growing level of organisation in the working-class movement of the capitalist countries, the political activity of the peoples of the colonies and the

* In July 1928, shortly before the Sixth Congress of the Comintern, Dmitry Manuilsky noted: "After the experience in China some comrades are inclined to believe that the Indian bourgeoisie will generally come forward only as a counter-revolutionary force and that even its opposition to British imperialism must be written off. When the theses of the Fifth World Congress were being drawn up Comrade Stalin correctly pointed out that the Indian bourgeoisie wanted a compromise with British imperialism. That is absolutely correct. But this gives no grounds for the very hasty generalisation that as a class the bourgeoisie must be struck out of the national liberation movement."

semi-colonies, and the aggravation of the contradictions between the imperialists deluded some Communists into believing that the temporary stabilisation of capitalism had ended and that the conditions had ripened for a rapid acceleration of the revolutionary process.

On the whole the experience of the Comintern demonstrated that the course towards an anti-imperialist united front was turning the Communist Party into a force whose influence was incomparably greater than its numerical strength. The Comintern acted on the principle that as the most active force in the national liberation movement the Communists gave it consistency, scope and power. This was the only way towards the hegemony of the proletariat in the anti-imperialist struggle of the oppressed peoples. From this position the Communist Parties in the Comintern were already then exercising a powerful revolutionising influence on the liberation struggle in the colonies and semi-colonies—the Middle East, Indonesia and China—awakening the peasant masses of these enslaved countries to political life. The Soviet Union with its enormous moral prestige, growing political weight and increasing defence capability gave the national liberation movement its mainstay. The Anti-Imperialist League continued to play an important role. During the years that it was in existence the League was joined by the Indian National Congress, the Workers' and Peasants' Party of India, the National Party of Indonesia, the National Party of Egypt and other anti-imperialist parties and organisations. The League functioned under the slogan: "Oppressed peoples and oppressed classes, unite!"*

However, the "class against class" tactics that were adopted at the close of 1927 and the beginning of 1928 hindered the implementation of the Leninist united front policy.

The Comintern's analysis of the situation in those days underrated the force of nationalistic, caste and religious traditions in the East. It was not that the *specifics* of the East were ignored. Note was taken of the "distinctive philosophy", the "heritage of former cultures and civilisations"

* For information on the Anti-Imperialist League see *The National Liberation Movement in Asia and Africa*, Russ. ed., Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1968; G. Z. Sorkin, *The Anti-Imperialist League (1927-1935)*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1965.

and the "special way of thinking linked with a different history and a different culture". Difficulties arose because some Communists wanted to put an end to the traditions of many countries in one sweep.

The first result of this approach was the largely negative attitude to the intermediate socio-political forces with whom joint action had earlier been considered permissible.

In the West this attitude was frequently adopted chiefly towards the Left Social-Democrats, and in the East towards non-proletarian anti-imperialist elements.

In 1928 Dmitry Manuilsky said: "In the Communist International today, as after the defeat of the German revolution of 1923, we have a deviation towards a revision of the united front tactics, a tendency to revise some of our basic principles in the question of our policy in the colonies, and to touch up Lenin. Some people are resurrecting old tendencies ... which boil down to regarding the role of the bourgeoisie in the colonial countries as played out, arguing that the bourgeoisie had fused with feudal forms of landownership and was, therefore, under all circumstances, a reactionary class which could play no role whatever in the opposition. Here and there it is argued that not only the bourgeoisie but also the petty bourgeoisie has ceased to exist as a factor and that the orientation should be on the proletariat and the peasantry."

The decisions adopted by the Sixth Congress of the Comintern (July-September 1928) on the national and colonial questions contained points that were subsequently recognised as erroneous. In this light it would be interesting to compare the initial and final texts of the theses entitled *The Revolutionary Movement in the Colonial and Semi-Colonial Countries* (the report on this problem was delivered at the Sixth Congress by Otto Kuusinen, who was prominent in the Comintern).

In the initial variant it was stated: "For the first time the proletariat has found itself in a position to play an independent role in the colonial revolution." In the final variant this passage read: "A salient feature of the second period of the upsurge of the working-class movement, which commenced in the colonies after the Fifth Congress, is the action of the working class of the colonies on the political scene as an independent class force opposing the national bourgeoisie and engaging in a struggle with it to uphold

direct class interests and win hegemony in the national revolution as a whole." The initial variant had the words: "The first onslaught of the workers' and peasants' revolution in China and soon afterwards in Indonesia was repulsed", which in the final text followed the sentence about the hegemony of the proletariat and read: "The history of the past few years strikingly confirms this feature of the second stage of the colonial revolutions, chiefly on the example of the Great Chinese Revolution and then the uprising in Indonesia."

In the initial text it was noted that "the bourgeois-democratic orientation of the colonial bourgeoisie ... has no significance as a force fighting imperialism". In the final text this concerned the national bourgeoisie as such and not its class position (i.e., not only its "bourgeois-democratic orientation"). One of the points in the initial text was formulated as follows: "Already at the current preparatory stage the working masses have to be helped, through correct communist tactics, to free themselves from the influence of national-reformism. This will not be achieved if at this stage the Communists simply brand the national-reformists as traitors and counter-revolutionary accomplices of imperialism. The national-reformists could make good use of such an attack and set the masses against the Communists (as elements 'hindering the national struggle'). Although, the national-reformists are, in effect, no less dangerous adversaries of the revolutionary movement than, for example, the feudal allies of imperialism, the Communists must in their agitation at this stage concentrate their fire mainly not against them or against the national bourgeoisie but against the present direct chief enemy, against the ruling imperialist-feudal bloc."

In the final text it was only stated that "the *masses* (our italics.—*Authors.*) regard the imperialist-feudal bloc as the direct chief enemy of national liberation". Also deleted were the words: "They (the Communists.—*Authors.*) must criticise the national-reformist parties and leaders principally not for their bourgeois and capitalist nature but for the betrayal which in all probability they will commit but have not yet committed."

The assessment of the petty-bourgeois parties was also amended. The following lengthy discourse on the revolutionary potential of the petty bourgeoisie was dropped in

the final text: "The revolutionary potential of the petty bourgeoisie (including the peasantry) must in the present epoch unquestionably be assessed much higher in these countries than in the independent states. This is due partly to the operation of the national factor and partly to the specific position of some strata of the colonial petty bourgeoisie (the undeveloped differentiation within the peasantry is the reason that the status of even the higher sub-strata of the peasants in most colonies and semi-colonies is sooner comparable to that of the poor peasants rather than the kulaks in some European countries; in the towns of the colonial countries there are large strata of semi-proletarian working elements, small artisans, coolies and poor people who may be carried along with the upsurge of the revolutionary wave; this applies also to the position of the petty-bourgeois intelligentsia, which in some respects is suppressed and is not sure of the morrow: its possibilities for development and for earning a livelihood are very limited, for example, in India where mass unemployment is observed among this stratum). Generally, at the initial stage of the bourgeois-democratic revolution in these countries we may assess the petty bourgeoisie, taken as a class, as a driving force of the revolution alongside the proletariat, although this does not, of course, rule out the possibility that some petty-bourgeois intellectuals may side with the camp of the national big bourgeoisie and even serve the interests of the feudal-imperialist bloc. Accordingly, at the first stage of the revolution most of the petty-bourgeois political groups and parties of these countries are of a national-revolutionary character and under certain conditions may, for some time, play a considerable role in the revolutionary struggle against imperialist or feudal rule."

Also deleted was the extremely important conclusion that for a certain period of the bourgeois-democratic stage of the revolution "not only the Communists but also various petty-bourgeois national-revolutionary groups may appear in the leadership of the revolutionary camp; it is even possible that the latter may carry much more weight with the masses than a newly-formed Communist Party and, therefore, will be in a position to retain the leadership in the struggle until further changes occur".

The years from 1929 to 1933 were a period of a sharp

anti-imperialist struggle of the peoples of colonial and semi-colonial countries. This struggle, both organised and spontaneous, acquired the most diverse forms and unfolded under different slogans and different programmes. In the movement were numerous anti-imperialist groups and organisations—Communist, national-revolutionary and national-reformist.

In face of the unprecedented hardships suffered by the masses during the years of the world economic crisis and the sharp rise of popular discontent, revolutionary impatience and the accompanying tendency to accelerate developments began to grow in the communist movement of the Eastern countries. After the Kuomintang leadership betrayed the revolution in 1927, the national movement in China and in some other countries ceased to be regarded as a possible ally of the proletariat in the struggle for independence. Lenin's conclusion that the national liberation movement was part of the world revolutionary process was revised at the time by some Communists with sectarian views. They regarded the liberation movement in the colonies as a direct socialist force. In practice this meant only an alliance with the revolutionary-proletarian movement in the oppressed countries or with the movement of the non-proletarian strata, whose most progressive elements had embraced Marxism-Leninism and were active under the banner of the Communist Party. The errors in assessing the political role of the Social-Democratic Parties and the national bourgeoisie, the course towards the direct establishment of the proletarian dictatorship in European countries in a situation where the alignment of class forces gave no grounds for putting this point on the agenda, the slogans recommended for backward countries and calling for the direct establishment of forms of power which signified putting the cart before the horse, were manifestations of a trend to step across an un consummated stage of the movement. In some cases these deviations from the Leninist concept of the world revolutionary process led to temporary miscalculations and defeat.

In some ways this line was mirrored in that period in the speeches of some participants and in the decisions of the 12th and 13th plenary meetings of the Comintern Executive (August-September 1932 and November-December 1933) and also in some of the decisions passed by the Presidium of the Comintern Executive in 1933.

The Leftist standpoint was particularly marked in the speeches of the delegates of the Communist Parties of a number of colonial and dependent countries. For instance, while justifiably stating that neglect of the "native" bourgeoisie was one of the reasons for the defeat of the 1926 uprising, the representative of the Communist Party of Indonesia nonetheless insisted on the slogan calling for a workers' and peasants' government. He obviously overrated the role and importance of the Communist groups which survived the suppression of the 1926 uprising in Indonesia. "The revolutionary forces of Indonesia," he said, "are growing rapidly and our influence is irrepressibly spreading among the working-class and poor peasant masses." In spite of the real situation, the representative of the Indian Communists declared that the "Indian proletariat is drawing ever closer to becoming the leading force in the popular movement". In assessing the role of the proletariat of the backward countries at that stage, the representative of the Communist Party of China drew a mistaken theoretical conclusion which mirrored the substance of the following view, which was predominant on the national and colonial questions at the time: "The proletariat is the only leader of the national liberation struggle in colonial and semi-colonial countries."

The Eastern Communist Parties, which had not yet scored major successes in the struggle to win the masses, laboured under the delusion that the proletariat was already or was becoming the leader of the revolution in the Eastern countries and that all the non-proletarian parties formed a more or less solid, unbroken reactionary front. While drawing on the vast experience of the Communists of Russia, many of these Communist Parties frequently used it in a doctrinaire manner, mechanically copying the 1917 tactics and slogans of the RCP(B) without properly weighing the situation in their own countries.

In 1917 in Russia—where the democratic revolution was not yet completed and where there was a relatively small but highly organised proletariat that had gone through an extensive school of class battles, and a huge number of poor peasants ruined by the imperialist war—a real possibility opened for a victorious socialist revolution, which was the only way out of the war that was pushing the peoples inhabiting the country towards an abyss, and the only way to carry out urgent democratic tasks. Lenin pointed out this

possibility to the Bolshevik Party, which within a short span of time had built up a powerful political army of the socialist revolution. The conciliatory Menshevik and Socialist-Revolutionary parties, which for some time enjoyed the support of considerable sections of the people, went over to the camp of the liberal bourgeoisie, i.e., the camp of the counter-revolution, when the tide of revolution began to rise, and became the principal obstacle to the socialist revolution. The exposure of the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries and their isolation from the masses were, therefore, an indispensable condition for the victory of the socialist revolution, which was on the threshold. The non-proletarian masses of Russia started the revolution under the leadership of the working class when they saw there was no other way out of the war, ruin and poverty.

In the 1920s and 1930s the situation was different in the countries of the East, where the main problem was the attainment of national independence. The hegemony of the working class and the accession of the Communist Parties to power were not the only way to achieve that aim. Broad sections of the bourgeoisie were fighting imperialism, and their Left wing, chiefly the petty bourgeoisie, adopted a national-revolutionary stand: great masses of working people supported the bourgeoisie. The proletariat was numerically weak, while the Communist Parties were small detachments of fighters. In this situation to strike at the nationalistic forces, particularly at their Left wing, signified an attempt to leap across an unconsummated stage of the revolution (in contrast to this, the assault that was made on the Mensheviks and Socialist-Revolutionaries in Russia in 1917 was vital to victory at a mature stage of the revolution). Consequently, by simply copying the pre-October tactics of the Bolsheviks they, in fact, closed their eyes to the concrete historical experience gained by the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in its struggle to win over the masses.

According to Lenin's teaching, the Communist Parties of the East should have induced the bourgeois reformists to wage a more determined struggle against imperialism and, at the same time, helped the Left, national-revolutionary forces to fight the influence of the national-reformists. However, by attacking the national-revolutionary forces as "myrmidons of imperialism", the sectarians in fact helped

the national-reformists against the national-revolutionary forces.

On the whole, in the period between the Sixth and Seventh congresses of the Comintern the Communists of a number of Eastern countries fought the national bourgeoisie, chiefly its Left wing, and remained a small heroic detachment, which even at the dearest cost, at the cost of its own blood, was unable to achieve its aims. The young Communist Parties of the colonial and dependent countries began to rid themselves of the infantile disease of "Leftism" only towards the end of the above-mentioned period. Here they were helped enormously by the line taken against sectarianism by the Comintern in 1934-35 and by their own experience of heavy defeat on the road of "Leftism" and of their successes when they adopted Leninist tactics and creatively used the CPSU's world-historic experience of winning political influence among the masses.

In those years China was the only Eastern country where a large and influential Communist Party functioned. But the composition of this Party was becoming more and more petty-bourgeois. In a country with a predominantly peasant population, the Party's proletarian line can be determined not so much by its *composition* as by the undivided *prestige* and correct, consistently proletarian policy of its leadership, by the ideological *armament* of membership, by proletarian *internationalism* and by an unrelenting *struggle* to prevent bourgeois nationalism, petty-bourgeois anarchism and "Left" and Right opportunism from filtering into the Party. But this was precisely where the non-proletarian elements in the CPC leadership fell short. There was more to this than the fact that after the defeat of 1927 the bulk of the Party's membership consisted of peasants. Some of the leaders had not gone through the school of proletarian struggle, had not mastered proletarian ideology and had time and again opposed the Comintern's line from Leftist, adventurist positions.

From the mid-1930s onwards some circles in the Communist Party of China came more and more under the influence of petty-bourgeois, nationalistic trends. Representatives of these circles became active in removing from the leadership those whom they deemed to be unsuitable, stopping the Party's work among the urban proletariat and "tying in" the revolutionary slogan of national liberation

struggle with the "Sinicisation of Marxism-Leninism". These leaders employed Leftist tactics.

In the 1930s the Chinese Red Army was compelled to re-locate its base to the northwestern regions of China. Its depleted units broke through to these regions, engaging in heavy fighting all the way. The strategy employed by the Chinese Communist Party sprang not only from the preponderance of strength enjoyed by the Kuomintang but also from the military and political line of its leadership, which demanded an "extended offensive along the entire front". At the same time, some of the CPC leaders steered a course towards a Soviet revolution on a nation-wide scale as a vital preliminary condition for repulsing Japanese aggression. This line was not supported by broad strata of the population and did not yield the expected results.

The Chinese people were prepared to fight the foreign invaders but still believed in the Kuomintang, this being the reason that they did not support the Soviet revolution. They sided with the CPC only after long and bitter experience made them realise that the Kuomintang was selling the nation's interests.

In 1931-34 the CPC leadership failed to utilise all of the Party's tremendous possibilities as a force objectively capable of playing the leading role in the national liberation struggle. The defeat in 1934 should have brought the CPC leadership round to the realisation that active participation in the national liberation struggle in a temporary alliance with the Kuomintang was an essential condition for the CPC's accession to power, in other words, that the road to victory lay through a united national front. From 1935 onwards, in line with the general course of the world communist movement the CPC began to employ united front tactics.

The strategy borrowed from the arsenal of the international communist movement and applied in the specific conditions obtaining in China at the time enabled the CPC to register a series of major successes in setting up an anti-Japanese national front.

During the first half of 1934 the Comintern began the general switch towards an anti-fascist united front in the West and an anti-imperialist united front in colonial and dependent countries. Convened in the summer of 1935, the Seventh Congress of the Comintern mirrored the key tenets formu-

lated by the Comintern leadership in the changed situation. Georgi Dimitrov, who delivered the report at this congress, focussed the attention of the Communist Parties particularly on the danger of sectarianism and in this connection said: "Today this is in many cases no longer an *infantile disorder*, as Lenin called it, but a *deep-rooted vice*, which must be eradicated if we are to resolve the problem of establishing a proletarian united front and lead the masses away from reformism to the revolution."^{*}

In the section of the Dimitrov report devoted to the anti-imperialist united front it was stressed that the specifics of each individual country had to be taken into consideration. For example, it was recommended drawing the broad masses into the National Liberation Alliance of Brazil and the slogan "All Power to the National Liberation Alliance" was recognised as being correct. The Indian Communists were advised to be active in the National Congress and help crystallise its national-revolutionary wing. The Communist Party of China was advised to work for the broadest possible anti-imperialist united front against Japanese imperialism and its Chinese agents. It would be a front of Communists "with all the organised forces existing in China prepared to wage an effective struggle for the salvation of their country and people".

Although the question of the national liberation movement was not a special item on the agenda, the decisions passed by the Seventh Congress directly touched on this issue for they marked a basic change in the tactics of the world-wide communist movement. In the last analysis, the errors committed by the Communist Parties in the highly developed capitalist and in colonial and dependent countries reflected the deep-rooted vice of sectarianism in the world communist movement. The Congress decisions removed the obstacles to setting up a united front—anti-fascist in the West and anti-imperialist in the East.

The resolution adopted by the Congress clearly oriented the Communist Parties on active participation in the mass anti-imperialist movements headed by the national-reformists and on the organisation of anti-imperialist actions

^{*} G. Dimitrov, *In the Struggle for a United Front Against Fascism and War. Articles and Speeches, 1935-1939*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1939, pp. 57-58.

jointly with the national-revolutionaries and national-reformists on the basis of concrete programmes.

A section of this resolution was devoted to China. Here attention was drawn to the task of promoting a popular anti-imperialist movement throughout the country under slogans of a national-revolutionary struggle.

Individual Parties of colonial and semi-colonial countries, with the exception of China, were advised to press for the creation of a "popular-revolutionary anti-imperialist government". It was suggested that this should be an anti-imperialist government without being a revolutionary-democratic dictatorship of the working class and peasantry because it would include representatives of the other classes participating in the struggle for national liberation. Such a government, it was specified, would carry out a programme of broad social reforms in the interests of the working people. The call for the creation of this government was not to be accompanied by slogans demanding the establishment of Soviet power. In other words, the slogan of struggle for Soviet power was, in effect, withdrawn for the colonial and semi-colonial countries at that stage of the revolution. Properly speaking, this conformed to the switch to the anti-imperialist popular front tactics. The call for the creation of a popular revolutionary anti-imperialist government was not recorded in the Congress resolution.

The policy charted by the Seventh Congress of the Comintern towards uniting all anti-fascist and anti-imperialist forces and the categorical condemnation of sectarian tactics provoked a stream of demagogic slander from the Trotskyites, who were feverishly attempting to win popular support with the aid of pseudo-revolutionary slogans. The Trotskyite "Fourth International" adopted a manifesto in which it accused the Parties of the Communist International of "abandoning the class struggle" and seeking to revive "the decaying corpse of capitalism". The Comintern's Leninist united front tactics were portrayed by the Trotskyites as being aimed at "putting the working class in the service of capitalism". The malicious demagogy of the Trotskyites could not, of course, prevent the people from correctly assessing the historic decisions of the Seventh Congress of the Communist International. Its conclusions on theory, strategy and tactics harmonised with the interests of the world revolutionary movement and won the wholehearted approval of

all socio-political forces that desired unity in the struggle against fascism, war and colonial slavery.

These decisions passed the test of time in the course of the subsequent struggle against fascism by the anti-Hitlerite coalition, and in the course of the then sharply mounting national liberation, anti-imperialist movement in the colonial and dependent countries. The Communists, armed with the Leninist programme calling for the unity of all revolutionary and national-patriotic forces, were in the van of this struggle.

* * *

The line evolved by the Seventh Comintern Congress laid the foundation for the conspicuous achievements of the world revolutionary movement during the next, second stage of the general crisis of capitalism. A powerful anti-fascist popular movement headed by the Communists came into being during the war under the banner of broader national unity.

With the Leninist strategy as their guide the Communist Parties were active in the struggle against fascist aggression during the Second World War. Drawn up by the European Communist Parties with the assistance of the leading organs of the Comintern, the concrete programmes for uniting the anti-fascist forces were a vital mobilising factor. They were founded on the decisions of the Seventh Comintern Congress, which had set Communists the task of securing for the working class and its political vanguard the premier role in the anti-fascist, revolutionary liberation struggle.

In 1940 when the nazis occupied Denmark, Norway, the Netherlands, France, Belgium and other countries, the Comintern helped the Communist Parties to better their mastery of the Leninist organisational forms of Party construction in accordance with the conditions of the struggle and set up stable, permanently functioning centres in and outside the occupied territories.

All this enabled the Communist Parties to become the leading and cementing force of the Resistance movement in the anti-fascist struggle.

Assessing the role played by the Communist Parties in the anti-fascist movement prior to the nazi invasion of the Soviet Union, the journal *The Communist International* wrote: "By defending their people and upholding their interests against the mercenary interests of the bourgeoisie and,

at the same time, fighting against the enslavement of their people by foreign imperialism and, in other countries, coming out against imperialist conquest and the enslavement of other peoples by their own bourgeoisie the Communists serve the cause of genuine proletarian internationalism because in this way they render the most effective assistance to their own people and to the working people of other countries.”*

In the hour when mortal danger overhung all the revolutionary, democratic and progressive achievements of the peoples, and their national independence and very existence were menaced, the Soviet Union, guided by its Communist Party, came forward as the principal phalanx of the anti-fascist forces fighting in the very centre of the battle against the nazi coalition and ensuring the defeat of that coalition.

In the capitalist countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition the Communist Parties worked to secure the most active participation of the people in the war against fascism, supported the measures taken by the governments to defeat nazi Germany and her satellites, and organised pressure on the governments to make them conduct the anti-Hitler war more energetically. In this struggle their unchangeable guideline was the great Leninist teaching of proletarian internationalism. They constantly explained to the people that the war started by German nazism against the Soviet Union was an assault not only on the world's first socialist state but also on all freedom-loving nations. The Communists tirelessly called upon the peoples of their countries to go resolutely to the defence of the Soviet Union, for that conformed to the national interests of all freedom-loving states. On June 22, 1941, the day on which the nazis launched their sneak attack on the USSR, the French Communist Party issued an appeal which expressed the firm confidence that fascism would be smashed. This appeal stated in part: “Every Frenchman worthy of the name must henceforth regard himself as an ally of the USSR. A Hitler victory over the USSR will be our defeat, and every victory of the USSR over Hitler will be our victory.”** In the countries occupied by the nazi invaders the Communist Parties started a Resistance movement,

* *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 4, 1941, p. 12.

** *International Solidarity of the Working People in the Struggle for Peace and National Liberation Against Fascist Aggression, for the Total Destruction of Fascism in Europe and Asia (1938-1945)*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1962, p. 283.

which became a component of the war against the fascist enslavers. The Communists initiated the formation of broad national fronts uniting the workers, peasants, urban middle strata, and patriotic elements and groups of the national bourgeoisie.

In the struggle against fascism the Communists of France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Greece, Yugoslavia and other countries set examples of unwavering courage and self-sacrifice. They were the staunchest champions of the rights and freedom of the peoples, and the most ardent patriots. By their heroism, by the blood they shed for the cause of the people, by their fidelity to the interests of the working people the Communists won immense prestige among the masses.

The Communists of countries of the fascist bloc—Germany, Italy, Rumania, Hungary, Bulgaria, Austria, Finland and Japan—contributed many stirring pages to the history of the anti-fascist struggle. They used every opportunity to show the people the criminal nature of fascism and, despite the most brutal persecution, they set up centres of resistance and gave all the help they could to the liberation war.

The war, the vast differences in the position of individual Communist Parties and the diversity of the specific tasks confronting them demanded, more insistently than in the pre-war period, that these Parties should be independent operationally and have the greatest possible manoeuvrability. Developments showed that “the organisational form of uniting the workers decided on by the First Congress of the Communist International as satisfying the requirements of the initial period of the resurgence of the working-class movement steadily outwore itself with the growth of that movement and the complexity of its tasks in individual countries, and that this form was becoming even a hindrance to the further strengthening of the national Workers’ Parties”.* In the light of this circumstance, the Presidium of the Comintern Executive, supported by all the Communist Parties, in May 1943 passed a decision to disband the Communist International.

The Comintern’s disbandment did not signify any weakening of the international communist movement as the reactionaries and all the enemies of communism hoped it would. True to the banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian

* *Kommunistichesky Internatsional*, No. 5-6, 1943, p. 8.

internationalism, the Communist Parties continued the struggle against fascism more energetically and with greater skill, hastening its defeat.

As a result of the struggle waged by the Communist Parties, whose day-to-day work was guided by Leninist revolutionary principles, the mass movements in many countries began to reach beyond the context of the anti-fascist, democratic struggle and develop into far-reaching social revolutions. The key factors predetermining the close interlacing of democratic and socialist elements in the struggle of the masses and the relatively fast and successful development of the people's democratic revolutions in a number of countries were: the broad, unitary nature of the movement itself and the decisive participation in it of the working class and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard; the impact of the achievements of socialism; the colossal growth of the Soviet Union's international prestige and might after the victory over nazism and Japanese militarism; the employment by the Communist Parties of correct strategy and tactics almost everywhere.

Having shown its great strength during the war, the world communist movement entered a new stage of development. Augmented by the finest fighters against fascism the ranks of this movement grew considerably. Before the war there were 4,200,000 Communists, but by the time the war ended their number had reached 20 million. The Communist Parties won tremendous prestige and influence among the people, becoming a major influential international political force.

The policy of working-class and democratic unity, formulated by Lenin and the Comintern, created the conditions and prerequisites for a new upsurge of the working-class and communist movement after the war, for the successful consummation of popular democratic revolutions and for the further consolidation of peace, democracy and socialism.

III

THE VICTORIOUS WORKING CLASS AND THE BUILDING OF THE NEW SOCIETY

The Marxist-Leninist theory of the transition from capitalism to socialism is essentially international. It is founded on the general laws of social development and takes into account the practical experience of the Soviet Union and of other countries that entered the road to socialism after the USSR.

A particularly large contribution to the development of the revolutionary theory and practice of socialist construction was made by Lenin, founder of the Soviet state. Soviet Communists and all Soviet people take pride in the fact that the difficult and honourable task of being the first in history to begin building a socialist society fell to the working class of Russia and the Bolshevik Party headed by Lenin. On this score Lenin wrote: "It is to the credit of that country and the party of the working class which achieved victory in that country, that they should take up in a practical manner the tasks that were formerly raised abstractly, theoretically. This experience will never be forgotten. This experience . . . cannot be taken away, no matter how difficult the vicissitudes the Russian revolution and the international socialist revolution may pass through. It has gone down in history as socialism's gain, and on it the future world revolution will erect its socialist edifice."*

The concrete historical experience of the struggle for the consolidation of socialism in the USSR unquestionably con-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 413.

tains some inimitable features, springing from Russia's specific historical and socio-economic development, the peculiarities of world development at the time and, last but not least, the creation of new social relations first in one country in face of incredible difficulties arising from the capitalist encirclement. However, the significance of the Leninist experience of building the new society reached beyond the national boundaries, acquiring a genuinely global character.

Characterising the historical heritage on which the Bolshevik Party could rely after it came to power, Lenin said: "All that we knew, all that the best experts on capitalist society, the greatest minds who foresaw its development, exactly indicated to us was that transformation was historically inevitable and must proceed along a certain main line, that private ownership of the means of production was doomed by history, that it would burst, that exploiters would inevitably be expropriated. . . . We knew this when we took power for the purpose of proceeding with socialist reorganisation; but we could not know the forms of transformation, or the rate of development of the concrete reorganisation."^{*} On the Bolshevik Party and its founder, Lenin, history devolved the extremely difficult task of theoretically elaborating and translating into reality the world's first-ever concrete plan of socialist construction.

The alignment of forces that took shape in Russia in 1917 after the overthrow of tsarism allowed the bourgeois-democratic revolution to develop into a socialist revolution. Cardinal importance was assumed by the question whether the objective conditions for socialism had matured in Russia and whether the proletariat could retain the power it had seized and begin the country's socialist reorganisation.

An outcome of the uneven economic and political development intrinsic to imperialism was that the political prerequisites for the transition to socialism matured in some countries, while in others the socio-economic conditions were ripe for such a transition. A peculiar situation arose in which a country where capitalist development was only on a medium level of development, i.e., a country less developed socio-economically than the leading industrial capitalist states of the West, proved to be closest of all to the proletarian revolution.

On this basis the Socialist-Revolutionaries, the Mensheviks

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 410.

and the overwhelming majority of the theoreticians of the Second International argued that the conditions for socialism had not matured in Russia and any attempt to accomplish a proletarian revolution would inevitably end in the defeat of the working class. This assessment deprived the proletariat of Russia of a revolutionary perspective, dooming it to the role of an appendage of the bourgeoisie.

Lenin thought differently. He was fully aware of all the difficulties that the specifics of Russia's socio-economic and cultural development put in the way of the transition to socialism, but at the same time he saw how to overcome these difficulties. "We must," he wrote, "bear firmly in mind that we have never set ourselves 'insoluble' social problems, and as for the *perfectly* soluble problem of taking immediate steps towards socialism, which is the only way out of the exceedingly difficult situation, that will be *solved only* by the dictatorship of the proletariat and poor peasants. Victory, and lasting victory, is now more than ever, more than anywhere else, assured for the proletariat in Russia if it takes power."*

A point on which Lenin laid particular emphasis was that the Bolsheviks were not out to "introduce" socialism immediately but to create favourable conditions for the building of socialist society as a result of the establishment of proletarian rule. "What if the complete hopelessness of the situation, by stimulating the efforts of the workers and peasants ten-fold, offered us the opportunity to create the fundamental requisites of civilisation in a different way from that of the West European countries? . . .

"If a definite level of culture is required for the building of socialism (although nobody can say what that definite 'level of culture' is, for it differs in every West European country), why cannot we begin by first achieving the pre-requisites for that definite level of culture in a revolutionary way and *then*, with the aid of the workers' and peasants' government and the Soviet system, proceed to overtake the other nations?"** The point, as Lenin saw it, was *not to wait passively for the entire range of factors and conditions necessary for developed socialism to mature but to create them in an active revolutionary way.*

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 26, p. 94.

** *Ibid.*, Vol. 33, pp. 478-79.

This was a bold scientific hypothesis and a signal political achievement of tremendous importance for the destiny not only of Russia but of the whole of world social development. Lenin's approach to the problem of building socialism has lost none of its eminent importance. It shows that the only way the working class can fulfil its great historical mission—the building of the new, communist social system—is to combine a strictly scientific, sober analysis of the prerequisites of socialism with a most determined and dedicated drive to accelerate their maturing and development.

HISTORIC MISSION OF THE PROLETARIAN DICTATORSHIP

In analysing the forms and methods of organising society in order to ensure the successful building of socialism, Lenin paid particular attention to the theory and practice of the proletarian dictatorship, i.e., the state power of the working people directed by the working class.

He regarded the dictatorship of the proletariat as the key law of the transition from capitalism to socialism. "The transition from capitalism to communism," he wrote, "is certainly bound to yield a tremendous abundance and variety of political forms, but the essence will inevitably be the same: *the dictatorship of the proletariat*."*

In stressing the universal significance of the dictatorship of the proletariat, his point of departure was mainly that no matter what the conditions of their development have been all socialist revolutions have some common features in the alignment of class forces—the proletariat, the bourgeoisie (and the other exploiting strata allied to it) and the petty bourgeoisie—deriving from the objective conditions of their existence.

The following are among the principal reasons by virtue of which the proletariat is called upon to play a special role in the state leadership of society during the transition from capitalism to socialism. First and foremost, it is the only class of bourgeois society directly interested in the consistent eradication of the very principle of private ownership of the means of production. Further, it is the most advanced and

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 413.

politically conscious section of the working people that is, owing to its position, best prepared to assimilate the ideas of socialism and to organise a determined and effective struggle for the realisation of these ideas. Lastly, it must be borne in mind that the class interests of the proletariat and its striving to abolish all forms of oppression, social injustice and inequality objectively concur with the basic interests of all working people and enable it to unite round itself the vast majority of the people with the aim of deposing the exploiting system and reorganising society along the principles of socialism and communism.

In the system of the proletarian dictatorship a special place is occupied by the revolutionary Party of the working class. Uniting workers with the highest level of class consciousness, it carries with it the entire proletariat. The ranks of the revolutionary Party are joined by advanced representatives of other classes who have adopted the position of the proletariat.

Furthermore, Lenin saw the reverse link between the class and the Party which made it imperative that in its policy the Party should take into account the opinion and views not only of the revolutionary vanguard but of the entire working class. He regarded the trade unions as the representative of the working class as a whole and condemned Trotsky's stand, which threatened to isolate the Party from the masses. In the early 1920s Lenin said: "If the Party falls out with the trade unions, the fault lies with the Party, and this spells certain doom for the Soviet power. We have no other mainstay but the millions of proletarians, who may not be class conscious, are often ignorant, backward and illiterate, but who, being proletarians, follow their own Party. . . . If we cause a split, for which we are to blame, everything will collapse because the trade unions are . . . the source of all our power."* The organic unity of the interests of the Party and the entire working class is a vital guarantee of the successful functioning of the proletarian dictatorship, the consolidation of the achievements of the socialist revolution and the building of the new society.

The historical need for the dictatorship of the proletariat during the transition from capitalism to socialism derives mainly from the irreconcilability of the two main classes

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 58.

(the proletariat and the bourgeoisie), from their struggle whose only outcome can be either the consolidation and further development of working-class power or the restoration of the bourgeois dictatorship. Assessing the experience of the Revolution and civil war in Russia, Lenin wrote: "No, the world is not built so happily; the exploiters, the brutal landowners, the capitalist class are not amenable to persuasion. The socialist revolution confirms what everybody has seen—the furious resistance of the exploiters."* The experience of the other countries that later took the road to socialism and also the experience of all interrupted and suppressed revolutions (for instance, the 1919 revolution in Hungary, the national-revolutionary war in Spain in 1936-39, and the civil war in Greece in the 1940s) abundantly demonstrate that the ruling classes do not quit the historical arena voluntarily, that depending on the alignment of internal and external forces they use all the means available to them to retrieve the positions they have lost: direct armed violence resting on the support of international reaction, economic sabotage, and ideological influence on wavering elements.

During the Great October Socialist Revolution the resistance of the Russian bourgeoisie and landowners was particularly savage. That was why there was so much violence. Noting that this was not the fault of the working class, whose ideal has no room for violence against people, Lenin said: "Dear capitalist gentlemen, you have only yourselves to blame. If you had not offered such savage, senseless, insolent and desperate resistance, if you had not joined in an alliance with the world bourgeoisie, the revolution would have assumed more peaceful forms."** At the same time Lenin foresaw that in other countries the conditions for the revolution would not be so stern as in Russia, that it would be accomplished "without the violence, without the bloodshed that was forced upon us by the Kerenskys and the imperialists", that it would proceed "by a different, more humane road".***

Indeed, the lessons of history allow us to pinpoint the following tendencies: the more the alignment of forces in the world and on the national scale changes in favour of socialism, the greater the maturity of the objective and subjective

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 465.

** *Ibid.*, Vol. 29, pp. 211-12.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 271.

prerequisites of socialism in a given country, and the more realistic the behaviour of the adversaries of the proletariat, the greater become the possibilities before the working class and its allies of resorting to more peaceful forms of struggle for the transition from capitalism to socialism.

Pointing out that the dictatorship of the proletariat was historically inevitable, Lenin stressed that it was necessary not only to paralyse the attempts of the exploiters to return to power but to win the huge mass of the petty-bourgeois, non-proletarian working people to socialism. He wrote that "the dictatorship of the proletariat is a specific form of class alliance between the proletariat, the vanguard of the working people, and the numerous non-proletarian strata of the working people (petty bourgeoisie, small proprietors, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, etc.), or the majority of these strata, an alliance against capital, an alliance whose aim is the complete overthrow of capital, complete suppression of the resistance offered by the bourgeoisie as well as of attempts at restoration on its part, an alliance for the final establishment and consolidation of socialism".*

The Right and "Left" "critics" of Leninism have often tried to counterpose to each other the various guidelines formulated by Lenin on the question of the alliance between the proletariat and the petty-bourgeois masses. Indeed, while noting that the proletariat alone takes power into its own hands, he emphatically rejected the attempts to characterise the Soviet state as being a workers' and not a workers' and peasants' state. Noting that "what is essential to win and retain power is not only the majority of the working class . . . but also the majority of the working and exploited rural population",** he wrote "on the basis of the teachings of Marx and the experience of the Russian revolution" that "the proletariat must first overthrow the bourgeoisie and win *for itself* state power, and then use that state power, that is, the dictatorship of the proletariat, as an instrument of its class for the purpose of winning the sympathy of the majority of the working people".*** Where the Right and "Left" doctrinaires looked for inconsistency, Lenin's genius revealed the real contradiction of life. He took note of the duality of the petty bourgeois, who was both a proprietor and a toiler.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 381.

** Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 476.

*** Ibid., Vol. 30, p. 263.

While still living under capitalism the petty bourgeois can become aware of the need for fundamentally changing the existing system and join the proletariat in the struggle to change that system. But under capitalist rule the petty bourgeois cannot free himself from the illusion that some "middle way" is possible which while rejecting the most odious features of capitalism would retain the very principle of private ownership. He cannot understand that in the long run socialism is the only alternative to modern capitalism with its monopoly rule. That is why the petty-bourgeois elements, who comprise a huge force, are, as Lenin put, inevitably doomed to vacillation between the proletariat and the bourgeoisie and can be neither the motive power of the old society nor the driving force of the new society.*

The history of a number of countries over the past few decades has demonstrated that given certain conditions the petty bourgeoisie can be an ally of the working class. However, when the urban and rural middle strata are deprived of links with the proletariat they may become a massive base for the emergence of a fascist or various other reactionary regimes.

Lenin not only warned of the danger of petty-bourgeois vacillation but showed how to overcome it. He guided the charting and successful implementation of the policy of the alliance of the working class with the peasants and other non-proletarian strata of working people. This was a key condition for the victory of socialism in the Soviet Union. Here Leninism acted, as it still does, on the principle that the working class can ensure the building of the new society only when it has the support of its allies from the non-proletarian strata of working people. Furthermore, Leninism proceeds from the identity of their interest in consistently effecting democratic reforms and preventing capitalist restoration. At the same time Leninism takes into account the political instability of the petty bourgeoisie and its inclination to vacillate between the forces of socialism and capitalism. All this not only predetermines the need and possibility for the victorious proletariat's alliance with the petty bourgeoisie but demands that in this alliance the leading role should be played by the proletariat, which is called

* Ibid., Vol. 28, p. 186.

upon to help the intermediate strata rid themselves of vacillation and gradually win them to socialism.

Lenin saw that in relation to the non-proletarian strata of working people an extremely important task was to win their trust and tear them away from the influence of the exploiting classes by upholding their vital socio-economic interests and guiding them into the channel of socialist construction by a series of flexible, cautious and thought-out measures.

It will be recalled that the alliance of the working class with the non-proletarian masses of working people in Russia formed and developed under the difficult conditions of intervention, civil war and economic dislocation, which compelled the Soviet state to take a series of emergency measures known under the general name of "war communism". This situation, which the working peasants could more or less understand while the civil war raged, led to a sharp rise of their discontent at the time the transition to peaceful construction was started. In this critical period the leading role of the working class in the alliance with the working peasants, as Lenin understood it, manifested itself with particular force. While giving his backing to the most determined suppression of the petty-bourgeois counter-revolution, that came to the open in the course of the Kronstadt uprising of 1921, in the wave of banditism that swept many regions of the country, and indirectly in large-scale profiteering, which undermined the already desperate state of the economy, and while sending the finest working-class cadres to fight hostile elements, Lenin raised in a most principled way the question of the need for removing the root causes giving rise to the discontent of the petty-bourgeois masses. The decisions to replace the surplus-appropriation system with a food tax and to go over to the New Economic Policy, adopted on Lenin's initiative, signified a radical change in the entire system of economic relations in the Soviet Union.

A quality distinguishing Lenin was that when he found himself confronted with a new situation, with the need for ensuring economic regeneration and strengthening the alliance with the non-proletarian majority of the working people, he did not hesitate to dismiss views that at the time had sunk deep roots in the minds of many Marxists. His line of combining centralised planned management with the utmost use of material incentives, commodity-money relations and every encouragement for local initiative determined the

economic policy of the Communist Party and Soviet Government for many years and decades ahead. This policy helped to resolve the most complex problems of the period of transition and retains its significance today, under conditions where socialism has triumphed.

Lenin's co-operative plan was a tremendous contribution towards the successful building of the new society. It provided forms of combining social and personal interests that were acceptable to the small producers and made it possible to effect the transfer of the peasants to farming along socialist lines. After collectivisation was completed the task of regulating the relations between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie fell away and was replaced by a qualitatively new task, that of ensuring the leading role of the working class relative to the socialist collective-farm peasantry.

The Leninist principles of ensuring a correct relationship between the working class and the peasants are applicable today not only in countries where the social structure is reminiscent of the structure that was in existence in Russia in 1917. Some key aspects of this experience retain their importance also for developed capitalist countries where the working class comprises the majority of the population, and the peasantry is many times numerically smaller. The socio-economic position, it must be borne in mind, determines people's political views not directly but only to the extent they become aware of their position. In many capitalist countries the political basis of the petty bourgeoisie is much broader than its social basis. That is what preserves in all countries the enormous importance of Lenin's tenets on the leading role of the working class and its Party, on utilising the struggle for consistent democracy (developing under different conditions and frequently under different slogans) to win the support of the intermediate strata of the population, and on the ways and means of overcoming the individual conservative and sometimes directly reactionary aspirations of the petty-bourgeois mass, on the one hand, and petty-bourgeois "Left" radicalism, on the other.

Also noteworthy is the consideration that when precedence is taken by non-peaceful forms of the struggle for socialism a considerable segment of the petty bourgeoisie prefers to keep away from active involvement and hardly affects the real alignment of forces. But when in some countries

more favourable opportunities arise for relatively peaceful forms of transition to socialism, this segment becomes an active political factor and may seriously influence the political situation. In this light the creative mastering and application of Lenin's teaching of the relationship between the working class and the petty bourgeoisie are particularly topical today for the developed capitalist countries as well.

One of the basic issues separating revolutionary Marxists from both the reformists and the petty-bourgeois revolutionaries concerns the possibility and need for employing compulsion during the transition from capitalism to socialism and the limits of compulsion.

As distinct from the reformists, Lenin, like Marx and Engels before him, held that on the proletariat's road to the conquest of power and in defending that power recourse to violence on a scale and in ways conforming to the degree of resistance put up by the ruling classes is not only permissible but necessary. He repeatedly made the point that rejection of violence would have doomed the revolution to inevitable collapse. However, in the same way as the conquest of political power by the proletariat is not an end in itself but only the key means for building a classless society, violence plays a necessary but subordinate role in ensuring the attainment of the chief, creative task of the proletarian dictatorship. Lenin wrote that "without revolutionary violence the proletariat could not have triumphed. Nor can there be any doubt that revolutionary violence was a necessary and legitimate weapon of the revolution only at definite stages of its development, only under definite and special conditions, and that a far more profound and permanent feature of this revolution and condition of its victory was, and remains, the organisation of the proletarian masses, the organisation of the working people. And it is this organisation of millions of working people that constitutes the best stimulant for the revolution, its deepest source of victory".*

Lenin insisted that violence and compulsion were expedient only in definite spheres: first, defence against the forces of the international imperialist reaction; second, class compulsion directed against the exploiting classes as a whole and manifested in measures to expropriate private property, institute labour conscription, and so forth; third, the suppres-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, pp. 89-90.

sion of active opponents of the Soviet state who fight it with weapons, members of an organised underground, gangs, subversive groups and so on; fourth, punishment of persons who violate the standards of behaviour and the laws established by the revolution; fifth, punishment for abuses, negligence and bureaucracy by officials of the new state apparatus.

At the same time Lenin repeatedly showed the harm of military methods of resolving major creative tasks of the proletarian revolution, of surmounting the difficulties of socialist construction, of promoting economic, scientific, technological and cultural development, and of settling the national question.

Today, when despite all their failures the "Lefts" not only have recourse to the formula that "the rifle decides everything" but also endeavour to impose these views on others, it is very much to the point to recall Lenin's warning to those who regarded the rifle as the only means of drawing, for example, the technological intelligentsia into the building of the socialist economy. "That," he wrote, "is a complete absurdity and a complete failure to understand what a rifle is for. After that one might think that a rifle is a bad thing, unless it is anarchist Ghe's head that is the bad thing."*

In criticising Trotsky during the debate on the trade unions, Lenin was explicit on the point that the problem of labour discipline should be solved by economic stimulation and promoting consciousness and not by militarising production which could alienate the worker masses from the Party. The same, he argued, applied to the attempts to turn the non-proletarian masses, the middle peasant in particular, towards socialism by force. "Representatives of Soviet power who permit themselves to employ not only direct but even indirect compulsion to bring peasants into communes," stated a resolution drawn up by him and adopted by the 8th Congress of the RCP(B), "must be brought strictly to account and removed from work in the countryside."**

Lenin considered violence out of place even with regard to the ruling classes if they did not put an active resistance. Early in 1919, pondering over the destiny of the former capitalists and landowners and on the possibility of enlisting

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 310.

** Ibid., Vol. 29, p. 218.

them into the service of the Soviet power, he wrote: "We suppressed their resistance—this had to be done. But this is not the only thing that has to be done. By the force of the new organisation, the comradely organisation of the working people, we must compel them to serve us. We must cure them of their old vices and prevent them from relapsing into their exploiting practices. . . .

"Well, what shall we do, throw them out? You cannot throw out hundreds of thousands!"*

After taking power, each Communist Party resolves in its own way the problem of the correlation between compulsion, education and organisation in the building of the new society. The time-tested Leninist principles on the correlation between violence and persuasion help them to avoid many errors.

A fundamental conclusion drawn by the founders of scientific communism as a result of their analysis of the experience of the Paris Commune is that the proletariat cannot rest content with the seizure of the bureaucratic state machine but must pull it down and replace it with their own apparatus. Enlarged on by Lenin, this conclusion became the point of departure for the building of the world's first proletarian state.

In the formation and development of the socialist state in Soviet Russia an immense role was played by the Soviets, which formed the political foundation of the new social system and in practice embodied the alliance of the proletariat with the non-proletarian masses of working people. "If the creative enthusiasm of the revolutionary classes had not given rise to the Soviets," Lenin noted, "the proletarian revolution in Russia would have been a hopeless cause."**

Immediately after the October Revolution the idea of Soviets quickly grew popular with the working people of many capitalist countries. Various organisations bearing the name of Soviets sprang up in some of these countries, but far from all of them mirrored the real interests of the working people. Among them were typical bourgeois, nationalistic organs, which adopted the name of Soviets out of demagogic considerations. Many expressed spontaneous revolutionary sentiments of the masses but, influenced by the opportunists,

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 73.

** Ibid., Vol. 26, p. 104.

they acted rather as representative trade union organs than as organs of the future political power. Soviets resembling those existing in Russia took shape only where the class struggle led to the victory of the working people (Hungary, and some regions of Germany).

The Right opportunists frequently accentuated individual specifics of the Soviets in Russia (wide use of violence against the deposed exploiting classes, some limitation of suffrage at the initial stage, and so on) in an effort to prove their unsuitability for other countries. Even Communists, who at the time could only draw on the experience of building socialism in one country, did not always distinguish between the general features of this experience and the various aspects which reflected the features of that period. Individual leaders of the working-class movement of some countries appeared to be quite ignorant of the Marxist-Leninist theory of the state and of concrete experience of setting up and promoting Soviets. That explained why at the close of the 1920s, in the 1930s and even in the early 1940s they counterposed the slogan of Soviets to the strategy of broad class and political alliances, disregarded the need for a struggle for democratic demands, refused to recognise that there had to be transitional stages to the socialist revolution and rejected the use of bloodless forms of the struggle for socialism. This was also one of the reasons why in the 1940s the Soviets did not become widespread in a number of countries that later became members of the world socialist system.

The development of people's democratic revolutions in a number of countries in Southern and Southeastern Europe gave birth to the thesis on the possibility of effecting the transition of popular-democratic states to socialism without the dictatorship of the proletariat. This thesis was based largely on the belief that the proletarian dictatorship could only exist in the specific form in which it took shape in Russia as a result of the October Socialist Revolution. Moreover, it reflected an underestimation of the resistance of the exploiting classes in these countries during the transition from capitalism to socialism.* By 1948, however, the thesis

* A point to be noted is that even later this underestimation of the class nature of the tasks facing socialist statehood in a society building socialism was one of the reasons for the grave difficulties in the development of countries like Hungary (1956) and, later, Czechoslovakia.

about building socialism in these countries without the dictatorship of the proletariat was dropped and replaced with the thesis about the two forms of the proletarian dictatorship: Soviet and people's democratic. Without any doubt this correctly took into account some major features of the revolutionary process and socialist construction in the People's Democracies. But here it would be a mistake to underrate the general laws of the socialist revolution and the common features that form a link between the experience of the Soviets in the USSR with the experience of state development in the People's Democracies.

If the international significance of the Soviets and Soviet power is considered not from the standpoint of mechanically applying the experience of the USSR but as an inevitable repetition of some of the most general principles and features of that experience in other countries, one can hardly question the fact that the establishment of a system of Soviet-type revolutionary organisations is an inevitable prerequisite for the conquest and consolidation of the working people's power in any country.

It will be recalled that it was none other than Lenin who was most emphatically opposed to any misinterpretation and profanation of the experience of the October Revolution. In *Greetings to the Hungarian Workers* he warned against a repetition of the errors committed by people who "confused certain specific features of Russian Soviet government, of the history of its development in Russia, with Soviet government as an international phenomenon".* In his remarks to the draft theses "Principles of the Third International", in which it was stated that the "Soviets of Workers' Deputies are the natural organs of the mass revolutionary struggle that after the victory of the uprising turn into organs of *power*", Lenin introduced an essential amendment: "Of the Commune or Soviets *type* (not necessarily 'Soviets')."**

Victorious socialist revolutions that established the power of the working class in a number of other countries after Russia enriched the Marxist-Leninist theory of the forms, methods and rate of the transition to socialism. Future socialist revolutions in other countries will undoubtedly

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 29, p. 388.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, 5th Russ. ed., Vol. 54, pp. 735, 502.

introduce more diversity deriving not only from the wealth of national specifics but also from the inevitable further change of the balance of world forces in favour of socialism. But in these revolutions, too, Lenin's teaching of the Soviets and the experience of Soviet power will retain their immense, unfading international importance. Lenin saw the fundamental significance of the Soviets chiefly in the fact that only an organised revolutionary struggle of the masses was the decisive prerequisite for the overthrow of the bourgeoisie and that only the dismantling of the bourgeois military-bureaucratic apparatus of suppression and its replacement with a system of revolutionary organs of the Soviet type could ensure the defence of the revolution's achievements and the successful fulfilment of its creative tasks.

The world's first socialist state was built as a result not only of the heroic efforts of the Soviet working class and of the Soviet people as a whole in the field of battle and labour but also of the broad international solidarity of the working people of all countries and, chiefly, of their vanguard, the Communists. Stressing the importance of the existence and successful development of socialism in the USSR for the entire world revolutionary movement, the Third Congress of the Communist International noted in its theses: "*Unconditional support of Soviet Russia* has been and remains the cardinal duty of the Communists of all countries."^{*} Lenin highly appraised this international assistance and regarded it as a major prerequisite for strengthening the world's first socialist state, writing that it was "the sympathy of the workers and peasants, the farm workers, throughout the world, even in the countries most hostile to us, the sympathy that was great enough to be the final and most decisive source, the decisive reason for the complete failure of all the attacks directed against us".^{**}

With the victory of the October Revolution the ideological influence of Leninism spread throughout the world. The example set by the proletariat of Russia showed the working people of all countries that there was a revolutionary way out of the sufferings to which they were doomed by capitalism. The Leninist slogans of peace and national and social emancipation were adopted by millions of fighters.

* *The Communist International in Documents, 1919-1932*, p. 199.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 33, p. 145.

The consolidation of socialism was accompanied by the growth of its ideological, economic, military and political influence over the course of world development. True, during the initial period not all aspects of this influence manifested themselves in equal measure. This can be appreciated if account is taken of the huge gap that existed in those days between the world's most advanced political system and the extreme backwardness of the material basis on which it could rely. But even in those difficult years, inspired by Lenin's teaching of internationalism, the working class of Soviet Russia rendered extensive political and, in some cases, even military assistance to peoples that rose against the capitalists and landowners and the foreign interventionists backing them.

The Soviet people's achievements in peaceful, creative work gave rise to new possibilities for extending the international influence of socialism. The practical implementation of the programme mapped out by Lenin helped the working people of the capitalist world to shed many prejudices regarding socialism which were fostered by bourgeois propaganda. Typical in this respect was, for example, a statement made by Hubert, member of one of the first French workers' delegations which visited the USSR in 1927: "No, I did not expect to find the dictatorship of the proletariat established in this fashion. It is a genuinely people's regime. I shall now try to forget all the rubbish that bourgeois newspapers stuffed into my head as into the heads of others."^{*}

The subsequent successes in carrying out the Leninist programme of industrialisation and collectivisation achieved against the background of the unprecedented crisis that shook the capitalist economy at the close of the 1920s caused not only friends but also many opponents to speak of the tremendous creative possibilities inherent in socialism.

The building of the foundations of socialism in the USSR powerfully influenced the international working-class movement.

The Leninist policy of peace became a major factor enhancing socialism's international prestige. World democratic public opinion gave its unqualified recognition to the

^{*} *The World Speaks of the Land of the October Revolution*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1967, p. 78.

consistent struggle waged by the Soviet Union in the interval between the two world wars to consolidate international security, establish peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems and unite the peoples against the mounting threat of fascism. On the 17th anniversary of the October Revolution Henri Barbusse wrote, assessing the historic significance of that struggle: "The entire world press, even Right-wing newspapers, with the exception of professional slanderers and people who wish to see nothing, recognise that the USSR is a powerful factor of peace; more, many press organs go so far as to declare that the Land of Soviets is the only factor of peace.

"This is true. It is only for a state built and administered in the interests of all the working people that peace, unconditional peace is an organic need."^{*}

World development was such at the time that the forces of socialism were inadequate to prevent the imperialists from kindling another world conflagration. The Second World War, sparked by the aggressive ambitions of German nazism and its allies, on the one hand, and on the other, by the attempts of the ruling circles of the Western imperialist powers, blinded by their hatred of the USSR, to strike a bargain with the aggressor, was not an ordinary war. Its outcome was to decide whether mankind would move farther along the road of progress or would be hurled many centuries back. The war years incontestably proved that it was thanks to the dedicated efforts of the Soviet people in building the new society that socialism was able to act in the anti-fascist struggle not only as a powerful ideological but also as a huge material force. This enabled the world's first socialist country to make the decisive contribution to the defeat of nazi Germany and her allies and thereby save many nations not only from bondage to a foreign country but also from the direct threat of physical extermination.

CONSOLIDATION OF WORLD SOCIALISM

The decisive role played by the peoples of the USSR in defeating nazism tremendously enhanced the influence of socialist ideas. Far-reaching internal political changes

^{*} Henri Barbusse, *Selected Works*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1952, p. 482.

took place in the capitalist world, particularly in countries that were victims of nazi aggression. During the concluding stage of the Second World War a revolutionary situation took shape practically in all countries that had fallen prey to German nazism and Japanese militarism, beginning from France and Czechoslovakia and ending with Indonesia and Vietnam. However, in some countries the further destiny of the revolutionary process was influenced not so much by the alignment of the class forces in them as by the international situation. In the countries that found themselves controlled by the Anglo-US bloc, the forces of international imperialism, acting in close alliance with the internal reaction and having recourse to economic, political and, in some cases, direct military pressure and interference, hindered the consistent implementation of democratic reforms, held up the further development of the revolutionary process and, in the end, preserved bourgeois practices.

In countries that were liberated by the Soviet Union the situation was different. In fulfilment of its mission of liberation, the Soviet Union did not seek to force its social system on the liberated peoples. However, the demolition of the military-terrorist machine of the invaders during the war, the abolition of puppet fascist regimes that were closely linked with the most reactionary elements of the local monopoly and compradore bourgeoisie, and then the defence of the liberated countries against the export of imperialist counter-revolution created favourable conditions for the rejuvenation of these countries on a new, genuinely democratic foundation and for society's reorganisation along socialist principles.

In a situation witnessing a massive revolutionary upsurge in 1944-45, a people's democratic regime was established in Poland, Bulgaria, Albania, Yugoslavia, Hungary, Rumania and Czechoslovakia. In these countries the monopoly bourgeoisie and the landowners were removed from power, the key positions passing into the hands of the working class headed by the Communists.

A feature of a number of people's democratic systems was that initially, in varying measure, the Communists shared power with a section of the bourgeoisie, which retained possession of some economic and political positions. This was due not only to the specifics of the obtaining international situation but also to the level of political maturity of con-

siderable strata of working people, who supported the Communists in the struggle for broad democratic demands but were still not fully appreciative of the historic need for further development towards socialism. In this situation the Communists of the popular-democratic countries steered a line not towards the direct introduction of socialism but towards the consistent implementation of fundamental political, social and economic reforms, that were put into effect with the active support of the broadest strata of the working people. The growing resistance of the bourgeois elements to the agrarian reform, the nationalisation of large-scale industry and the purge and democratisation of the state apparatus, and the suppression of economic subversion and profiteering led to their political isolation from the people and created the conditions for the final demolition of their political and economic positions. In individual countries of Central and Southeastern Europe the concentration of all power in the hands of the working class proceeded at different rates of intensity and was to all intents and purposes completed prior to 1949. A new important element strengthening socialism in Europe was the formation of the German Democratic Republic—the first workers' and peasants' state in the history of the German people—in the autumn of 1949.

The final defeat of the bourgeois reaction in the countries of Central and Southeastern Europe was a vital factor contributing towards the social emancipation of the people, the consolidation of their national independence and the preservation and consistent realisation of their democratic achievements. This was further splendid confirmation of Lenin's prevision that at a certain stage of development "consistent democracy, on the one hand, is *transformed* into socialism and, on the other, *demand*s socialism".*

In the favourable conditions created by the defeat of German nazism and Japanese militarism, the dawn of socialism rose also for some Asian peoples, who won liberation from imperialist oppression. The Democratic Republic of Vietnam was proclaimed as early as 1945, but almost immediately its people were compelled to fight a bitter war to defend their independence against aggression by French and then by United States imperialism. The Korean People's

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 25, p. 452.

Democratic Republic was formed in the autumn of 1948. The proclamation of the People's Republic of China in October 1949 crowned the historic victory of the Chinese revolution. In 1959 the revolution triumphed in Cuba, the first country of the American continent to take the road of socialist development.

The victory of people's democratic and socialist revolutions in a number of countries in three continents was the most important event of our epoch after the Great October Revolution and started a new stage of the development of the world revolution. It showed that socialism had become a world system.

Despite the diversity of the socialist revolutions in the different countries there were in their development some general laws of the transition from capitalism to socialism. These laws, formulated and enlarged on by Lenin, underwent their first test during the October Revolution. At the same time, their manifestation had a number of features reflecting not only the specifics of each individual country but also some new trends of historical development as a whole.

One of these features was linked with the fact that the liberation movement of the peoples of enslaved countries was directed not only against foreign invaders but also against the internal reactionary forces, chiefly the monopoly bourgeoisie and landowners, who were closely linked with the foreign invaders. This gave the democratic national liberation movement a profound social content.

Another feature was linked with the more pronounced reactionary nature of imperialism itself, and with the deepening of its internal contradictions and antagonisms. In face of the mortal danger that hung during the Second World War not only over the working-class movement but over entire nations, the anti-fascist, anti-imperialist front was enlarged, thereby giving rise to further possibilities for promoting the class alliances of the proletariat and fighting for democracy and socialism.

Also an extremely important feature of these revolutions was that they took place not in isolation but could rely on the assistance and support of a great socialist power, the Soviet Union. This created more favourable conditions for the development of the revolutionary process, preventing the export of counter-revolution, determining the best

methods and time-limits for fundamental socio-economic and political reforms and for choosing the least painful forms of carrying them into effect. The experience of these countries allows us to regard as a law of the world revolution the fact that every new country starting out on the revolutionary reorganisation of society, on the road to socialism, has increasingly more favourable conditions for this and can, provided its Communist Party pursues a correct policy, move along this road with less difficulty and sacrifice.*

The victory of the socialist revolutions in a number of countries in three continents confirmed the universal significance of the theory of scientific socialism and, in particular, of the Leninist stage of its development. The consistent and creative application of the principles of the transition from capitalism to socialism as evolved by Lenin is the principal guarantee of success in the countries of the socialist community. "The Leninist plan of socialist construction and the entire teaching of the great Lenin," said János Kádár, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Hungarian Socialist Workers' Party, "are of decisive importance for the successful building of socialism in our country. . . . In the history of the Hungarian communist movement attention is drawn by the circumstance that when the Party correctly applied Lenin's teaching it moved from success to success, but when in theory and practice it deviated from that teaching it was dogged by setbacks."**

The peoples of the socialist community led by Communist and Workers' Parties, which are steering the Leninist course, have reached important milestones in their development. The Soviet people have carried out the grandiose tasks involved in the building of socialism and entered the stage of communist construction. "The 1960s," L. I. Brezhnev noted, "will occupy a special place in the history of world socialism. It was in this decade that many fraternal countries completed the foundations of socialism and went over to the building of developed socialist society. As it matures the socialist system more and more fully reveals the advantages of its economic, social and political organisation and its inherent genuine democracy. All this is a tangible and

* B. Ponomarev, "The October Revolution—Beginning of the Era of Socialism and Communism", *World Marxist Review*, No. 11, 1967.

** *Nepszabadság*, June 5, 1966.

weighty contribution to our common cause, the cause of consolidating the anti-imperialist front.”*

By utilising the advantages of planned economic advancement, resting on public ownership of the means of production, and being guided by the Leninist teaching that the building of the corresponding material and technical basis is the key condition for reorganising society along socialist lines, the countries of the socialist community have made rapid headway in economic development. In the period from 1950 to 1968 the total industrial product of these countries increased nearly 6.3-fold. The following table gives a fuller picture of the development of individual countries.

Rate of Growth of Industrial Output in Socialist and Capitalist Countries (1950=100)

Country	1960	1965	1968
Soviet Union	304	458	592
Bulgaria	397	691	982
Hungary	267	386	471
German Democratic Republic	292	390	468
Mongolian People's Republic	303	499	634
Poland	338	508	642
Rumania	340	649	916
Czechoslovakia	282	364	440
Democratic Republic of Vietnam	504	929	...
Korean People's Democratic Republic	635	12-fold	25-fold*
USA	145	191	221
Britain	135	159	168
France	180	229	258
Federal Republic of Germany	242	319	356

* 1948=100

Source: *National Economy of the USSR in 1968*, Russ. ed., "Statistika", Moscow, 1969, pp. 151-52.

In the level of economic development the gap between the socialist countries and the leading capitalist states has narrowed down considerably as a result of accelerated industrial growth. In 1950 the socialist system as a whole produced about 20 per cent of the world industrial output, and

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 145.

in 1968 it accounted for roughly 39 per cent of the output. Suffice it to say that in the period from 1960 to 1968 industrial output in the Soviet Union rose from 55 to nearly 70 per cent of the United States level.* Unquestionably, the socialist community's share of the world industrial product will continue to grow and thereby ensure the socialist world with further achievements in the economic competition with capitalism.

Substantial changes have taken place in the development of agricultural production as well. For example, the average annual grain and legume output in the CMEA countries grew from 131 million tons in 1951-55 to 219 million tons in 1966-67. The output of animal husbandry increased more than 50 per cent between 1950 and 1967. In the Soviet Union farm output increased nearly 33 per cent during the first eight years of the 1960s.

The growth of socialism's material basis created the conditions for systematically raising the standard of living. In 1967 real incomes per head of the population in the USSR increased 6 per cent (during the first eight years of the 1960s they increased 43 per cent), and the cash incomes of the population rose 3.8 per cent in the German Democratic Republic, 9.1 per cent in Rumania and 7.3 per cent in Czechoslovakia.

Members of the world socialist system have registered striking advances in education and culture, outstripping many leading capitalist states. This is shown, in particular, by comparable data on the number of students at institutions of higher learning in the socialist and in some capitalist countries.

During the past twenty years the number of persons with a higher or secondary special education has grown considerably in the socialist countries. Moreover, the rise of the cultural and educational level has been accompanied by the abolition of social barriers to the summits of knowledge, science and culture. These achievements become particularly striking when it is borne in mind that these countries had to begin with the eradication of elementary illiteracy among part of the population, this being a legacy left by the old system.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 166.

Number of Students in Socialist and Capitalist Countries

	Academic year	Number of students	
		Total ('000)	Per 10,000 of the population
<i>Socialist Countries</i>			
Soviet Union	1967/68	4,311	182
of which, engineering specialities	1967/68	2,061	87
Bulgaria	1967/68	84	101
Hungary	1967/68	84	82
German Democratic Republic	1967/68	107	62
Mongolian People's Republic	1966/67	11*	101*
Poland	1967/68	287	90
Rumania	1967/68	142	73
Czechoslovakia	1967/68	137	96
Democratic Republic of Vietnam	1964/65	27	15
Korean People's Democratic Republic	1964/65	185	155
Cuba	1967/68	40	50
Yugoslavia	1966/67	195	98
<i>Capitalist Countries</i>			
USA	1966/67	4,136	210
of which, engineering specialities	1966/67	290	15
Britain	1965/66	346	63
Federal Republic of Germany	1966/67	282	49
France	1965/66	430	88
Japan	1965/66	886	90

* Including students studying abroad.

Source: *National Economy of the USSR in 1967, Statistics*, Russ. ed., "Statistika", Moscow, 1968, p. 176.

The social structure has undergone far-reaching changes. In the Soviet Union there has been a rapid numerical and qualitative growth of socialist society's leading force, the working class, and also of the intelligentsia, and the eradication of the essential distinctions between industrial workers, collective farmers and workers by brain continued. In other socialist countries this period witnessed a radical reorganisation of the social structure along the lines of socialism.

The forms in which the exploiting classes were abolished in the different countries were largely determined by the strength of their resistance to socialist changes. In some countries, as part of a series of transitional measures, mixed

state-private enterprises were set up, and the members of the former exploiting classes were allowed to retain part of their property for personal requirements. Practice shows that the re-education of the remnants of the deposed exploiting classes is a complex and drawn-out process. Furthermore, experience demonstrates that the stronger the power of the working class and the less the hopes of the former exploiting classes for restoration, the easier it is to draw all sections of the people into the building of socialism. At the same time difficulties in building the new society grow out of any activation of the anti-socialist aspirations of the former exploiters, especially when they have the opportunity for organised unity. One of the most important tasks of the socialist state is, therefore, to cut short any attempt on the part of former exploiting elements to organise.

The practice of the fraternal socialist countries has reaffirmed the significance of Lenin's ideas on co-operation for the transfer of the small producers of town and countryside to the socialist way of life. In Bulgaria, Hungary, the Korean People's Democratic Republic, Rumania and Czechoslovakia collectivisation was completed in the main in the 1950s. This process developed differently in the various countries. For instance, in Poland the substantially slower rate of direct socialisation of small-commodity production was to some extent compensated by the large-scale promotion of the socialist state's economic links with the rural supply and marketing co-operatives and with individual peasant husbandries. However, the experience of all the socialist countries has shown that socialism cannot be built successfully without using as a guide Lenin's teaching that there must be no capitulation to the petty-bourgeois element and no artificial jumping over the various stages of co-operating small-scale production.

The far-reaching socio-economic and political plans put into effect under the leadership of the ruling Communist Parties brought the socialist world to the development stage "when the possibility arises of utilising on a scale far greater than ever before the tremendous potentialities inherent in the new system".* While formerly efforts were directed chiefly towards eradicating the abominable legacy of capi-

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 22.

talism and applying the principles of socialism, today the socialist community is faced with the task of mapping out the methods and forms of making the most effective use of socialism's objective potentialities and advantages. "The application of science in various social and economic fields and the full utilisation of the potentialities opened up by the scientific and technological revolution for speeding up economic development and for satisfying the needs of all members of society are made possible by socialist ownership, the planned organisation of production, and the active participation of workers by hand and by brain in guiding and managing the economy."*

Accelerated scientific and technological progress is a major condition for the successful development of socialist society.

A feature of the present stage of world development is that the fundamental revolutionary reorganisation of social relations and mankind's transition from capitalism to socialism are being accomplished under the conditions created by the current scientific and technological revolution and are linked with the major achievements of science and technology—the discovery and utilisation of nuclear energy, the development of automation, electronics and rocketry, science's massive penetration into production, and the utilisation of outer space which is increasingly influencing terrestrial life.

Modern science and technology are opening up new possibilities and prospects for the socialist countries. They are making it possible to create incalculable material and cultural wealth, lighten work, enormously boost its productivity, adorn man's everyday life, remake and harness nature, multiply man's physical and intellectual strength and develop the boundless expanses of the universe. As one of the speakers at the Moscow Meeting pointed out, an "important requisite for the development of socialist society is to give full scope to the scientific and technological revolution, which has become one of the main sectors of the historic competition between capitalism and socialism".**

The Soviet Union has registered outstanding successes in

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow* 1969, p. 22

** Ibid.

science and technology. Soviet society is developing on the basis of modern scientific and technological achievements. The scientific administration of society is growing more diversified with the growing scale and efficiency of the socialist economy, the unfolding of the modern scientific and technological revolution, the improvement of the system of social relations and the upsurge of culture. Under these conditions it is more important than ever to take the objective laws of social development strictly into account and analyse the complex interlacing and interaction of the various aspects of social life.

In the Soviet Union the Communist Party and the Government give much of their attention to improving the processes and system of administration. In recent years the CPSU has adopted some important decisions showing the striving to place the administration of society on a more realistic, truly scientific foundation. Of great importance in this respect were the Party's decisions to set up a new system of industrial management with the object of achieving a fundamental improvement of economic planning, stimulating labour and making the utmost use of economic methods of management, of levers linked with commodity-money relations. These measures were dictated by the objective course of Soviet society's development and by the demands of scientific and technological progress.

Industrial management, particularly in techniques and technologies, is enormously influenced by the modern scientific and technological revolution. This revolution has deepened production differentiation into branches specialising in the output of definite commodities. But differentiation and the accompanying appearance of new branches enhance the role of inter-branch links, organisation and co-ordination, elements that can be effectively ensured only by centralised economic management. Moreover, this revolution has predetermined the creation of branches of production, science and technology (nuclear power, rocketry, aircraft-building, space exploration, and so on), which cannot conceivably be organised and promoted without the association and concentration on the level of individual countries and even on the inter-state level of vast funds and materials and the effort of large bodies of scientists, engineers, workers and executives. The volume, complexity, intensity and rate of technical and technological transformations are growing, the rhythm of

production is being speeded up and production relations are developing and expanding.

True, the colossal and extremely diversified mechanism of socialist production to some extent makes it difficult to pinpoint details from a single centre. The most numerous and most qualified central apparatus cannot always provide a correct and quick solution for the various problems that arise daily in the life of society. Hence the need for giving the enterprises broader operational independence, for efficient production management is inconceivable without such independence.

To meet this situation economic reforms are being put into effect in the USSR and some other socialist countries. Here cost relations are used to reinforce and improve centralised state planning, i.e., in conformity with the Leninist *principle of democratic centralism*. One of the cardinal targets of the current five-year plan, state the Directives of the 23rd Congress of the CPSU, is to secure the maximum development of democratic principles of management coupled with the consolidation and improvement of the centralised planned management of the national economy.* Thus, it is not a matter of diminishing the role of the state in economic management but of stepping up the efficiency of centralised leadership through the fuller employment of economic methods of management.

An improvement of planning and economic incentives is an earnest of further headway in socialist construction. This is shown, in particular, by the fact that the European socialist countries which have adopted this course have surmounted the certain economic deceleration of the early 1960s and secured a marked growth of the rate of economic development.

At the same time the enhancement of the economic and social efficacy of production is indissolubly linked with the further improvement of the mechanism of social administration and with the promotion of socialist democracy, the initiative of the people and their active enlistment into the decision of all problems, big and small, in accordance with the requirements of mature socialist society. "The problem of democracy, to be more exact, of socialist democracy," First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian

* 23rd Congress of the CPSU, Moscow, 1966, p. 322.

Communist Party Todor Zhivkov noted in a speech at a plenary meeting of the Party Central Committee in November 1968, "has always been a pressing one. But today, lately, it has grown into a particularly pressing, and I would say, even the cardinal theoretical, political and ideological problem. . . . We know that the socialist system cannot advance without the most active participation of the people in economic, cultural and political development, without boosting their political awareness. More—it cannot exist. Therefore, under socialism the extension of democracy is an expression not only of a subjective good wish but of an objective need of socialist development."^{*}

This enhances the importance of the Marxist Party and its leading role in the building of the new society. The transition to a higher phase of the development of socialism unquestionably demands an improvement of the methods of implementing the Party's leading role and the further elaboration of the Leninist norms of inner-Party life. But this has nothing in common with the Right-revisionist preachings of the withering away of the Party's leading role in proportion to the further development of socialist society, or with theories about the transition to various so-called pluralist systems and the concentration of administration in the hands of a narrow elite, or with the antipodal theories of the anarcho-syndicalist type, whose substance is that ultimately "everything must be decided by everybody".

Actually, when socialist countries enter the stage of developed socialism this accentuates the importance and role played in the mechanism of social administration by an organisation, which:

- determines society's long-term development and the principal ways and means of promoting this development on the basis of a thorough-going study of economic, social, political and psychological factors;

- ensures the best possible combination of current and long-term individual, group and social requirements and the interests of various groups and strata, and co-ordinates the work of the different state and public organisations and institutions with the purpose of achieving the most successful advance towards socialism and communism;

^{*} *Information Bulletin of the CC of the Bulgarian Communist Party*, No. 14, 1968, pp. 11, 13.

secures united action by all classes and social strata, and all links of the mechanism of social administration for the fulfilment of adopted decisions, action without which socialist society cannot develop normally.

These tasks can only be fulfilled by a party of the Leninist type, armed with a scientific theory and uniting the most active and politically conscious section of the people.

Having become a world system, socialism has called to life new social, economic and political laws. One of them is the establishment of a new type of relations between countries in which the socialist system has been consolidated. These relations of friendship, fraternity and mutual assistance rest on the solid foundation of unity of ideology and of the economic and political system and a community of basic interests and aims. The authors of *Manifesto of the Communist Party* wrote that hostile relations between nations would disappear with the disappearance of the antagonism between classes within the nation. However, in making this forecast neither they nor Lenin believed that the new type of relations between countries of the victorious proletariat would take shape automatically. Meditating on the ways in which the free community of peoples would develop, Lenin wrote: "We want a *voluntary* union of nations—a union which precludes any coercion of one nation by another—a union founded on complete confidence, on a clear recognition of brotherly unity, on absolutely voluntary consent. Such a union cannot be effected at one stroke; we have to work towards it with the greatest patience and circumspection. . . ."

The moulding of these relations is a long process, and success depends largely on the policy pursued by the ruling Communist Parties, on the extent the Party influences the masses and on its ability to educate them in the spirit of proletarian internationalism.

This process is influenced also by a body of factors linked with the historical conditions of the given country's development and with its economic and social level. A reliable guideline for the approach to these problems is provided by Lenin, who wrote: "Our experience has left us with the firm conviction that only exclusive attention to the interests of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 293.

various nations can remove grounds for conflicts, can remove mutual mistrust, can remove the fear of any intrigues and create that confidence, especially on the part of workers and peasants speaking different languages, without which there absolutely cannot be peaceful relations between peoples or anything like a successful development of everything that is of value in present-day civilisation.”*

While strictly abiding by Lenin's injunction on the need to take national specifics into account, the Communist Parties reject any attempt to absolutise the features of the development of given socialist countries and patiently explain the social and gnosiological source of ideas about national exclusiveness. The national awareness of peoples grows with the successful building of socialism because the new social system allows their countries to act independently and play a prominent role in the world. But explosions of nationalism may occur if these facts are presented as the achievement of only the national forces without indicating that the given socialist country owes its international prestige not only to itself but also to the fact that it is part of a great socialist community.

An important task of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries is to define correctly the relationship between the national and common objectives of the entire socialist community at every stage of socialist development. In working “to develop all-embracing co-operation between their countries and ensure fresh successes in the decisive areas of the economic competition between the two systems” they map out their policy in such a way that “on the basis of the socialist countries' fundamental interests and aims and of the Marxist-Leninist principles . . . the socialist system should place greater reliance on the international socialist division of labour and voluntary co-operation between them, which rules out any infringement of national interests, and ensures the advance of each country and consolidates the might of the world socialist system as a whole”.**

A tangible expression of the new type of relations between states and the application of the principles of proletarian internationalism in the building of the new society

* Ibid., Vol. 33, p. 386.

** *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 23.

was the establishment in 1949 of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, the first international socialist organisation. During the past twenty years CMEA has played a big role in promoting co-operation between socialist countries. It displays respect for the principles of equality and sovereignty and sets an example of consistent mutual benefit and comradely mutual assistance in relations between countries. This is what basically distinguishes CMEA from capitalist inter-state organisations.

CMEA organises all-round economic, scientific and technological co-operation directed towards the most rational utilisation of natural resources and speeding up the development of the productive forces. It facilitates the international socialist division of labour by co-ordinating economic development plans and promoting production co-operation and specialisation.

In the initial period after it was set up CMEA concentrated chiefly on promoting scientific and technological co-operation and trade among its members. To date the CMEA members have transferred to each other over 40,000 sets of scientific and technological documentation. In 1967 their foreign trade topped the 1950 level nearly 5.5-fold. In that period their share of world trade grew more than 50 per cent, reaching 10.3 per cent. Long-term agreements play a large role in the trade between them.

In the early 1960s the co-ordination of economic development in the course of which important economic problems were resolved acquired prominence in CMEA's work. The Druzhba (Friendship) Oil Pipeline, which has already piped about 85 million tons of oil, and the Mir (Peace) Power Grid were built on CMEA's recommendation. In 1967 the grid transmitted 8,500 million kwh of electric power.

CMEA activities tangibly benefit the economy of its individual members and the world socialist system as a whole. "If we take, for instance, the member countries of the Council for Mutual Economic Assistance, we shall find that during the past ten years their national income has increased 93 per cent, while in the developed capitalist states the national income rose 63 per cent in the same period. Occupying 18 per cent of the world's territory and having only 10 per cent of the world's population, the CMEA countries now account for approximately one-third of the world industrial product. On this foundation the people's standard of living is rising

and increasing possibilities are opening for further successful economic, scientific and cultural development.”*

CMEA continues to improve the forms and methods of co-operation, constantly looking for the best variants. Tremendous importance is now attached to ways and means of making the utmost use of the achievements of the scientific and technological revolution in order to expand the material and technical basis of world socialism. *Nowe drogi*, organ of the Central Committee of the Polish United Workers' Party, rightly notes that among themselves the CMEA countries have “attained a fairly high level of economic relations of a structural nature”.**

An exceedingly important event in the life of the world socialist system was the 23rd Special Session of CMEA held in Moscow in April 1969. This session, which demonstrated a desire for greater unity in the building of socialism and communism, was attended by the leaders of the Communist and Workers' Parties and heads of state of the member-countries: Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, the Mongolian People's Republic, Poland, Rumania and the Soviet Union. Attention was focused mainly on ways and means of improving the co-ordination of plans, specialisation and co-operation of production. The session found that it was expedient to set up a CMEA Investment Bank and recommended the promotion of mutually beneficial economic relations with other socialist and also with non-socialist countries, regardless of their social system.

A big role in establishing the new type of economic relations and in furthering the work of CMEA is played by the Soviet Union. In the period up to January 1, 1967 it helped the socialist countries to build and equip more than 1,400 industrial projects. The USSR is the principal supplier of many kinds of industrial raw materials to the countries of the socialist community. In these countries new industries have emerged and developed rapidly on the basis of trade with the Soviet Union.

The development of the new type of relations and the strength and influence of the world socialist system depend largely on how reliably the socialist labour of the peoples

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 145.

** *Nowe drogi*, No. 3, 1969, p. 5.

of the socialist community is guarded and on the strength of their armed forces. This concerns not only the combat capability of the national armies but chiefly the united armed forces of socialism. Set up in May 1955, the Warsaw Treaty Organisation is a dependable shield of the socialist peoples and so long "as the aggressive NATO bloc exists", this organisation "has an important role to play in safeguarding the security of the socialist countries against armed attack by the imperialist powers and in ensuring peace".*

The possibility of relying on the growing military and economic potential of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries is the decisive factor ensuring the independence and sovereignty of all nations threatened by imperialist aggression. "Had it not been for the Soviet Union," said Fidel Castro, Prime Minister of Cuba's Revolutionary Government, "the imperialists would not have hesitated to attack our country. It was precisely the might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp that deterred imperialist aggression against our homeland. Naturally, we are profoundly and eternally grateful to the Soviet Union. This convinces us that any nation, no matter how small or distant, can fight for a better life in the knowledge that the imperialists cannot destroy it with impunity."**

The world socialist system is the material, moral and political backbone of the world revolutionary process and the bedrock of the struggle of the peoples against imperialism and war, for peace, democracy and socialism. It is the *decisive force in the anti-imperialist struggle*.

Noting that the world socialist system "absorbs all the wealth and diversity of the revolutionary traditions and experience deriving from the creative activity of the working people of different nations", L. I. Brezhnev stressed in his speech at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties that it was necessary to study this experience constantly and utilise "everything of value that may be applied in the conditions obtaining in the Soviet Union, everything that helps to strengthen the socialist system and embodies the general laws of socialist construction which have been tested by international experience".***

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 23.*

** *Pravda*, April 29, 1963.

*** *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 148.*

IV

THE WORKING CLASS — THE LEADING FORCE OF THE ANTI-MONOPOLY STRUGGLE IN THE CITADELS OF IMPERIALISM

After the Second World War, which ended with the rout of fascism, the international working-class and democratic movement, and the national liberation struggle rose to a qualitatively new stage. The struggle was joined by many millions of people who learned from their own experience that the social and political structures of capitalism not only failed to ensure a further democratic advance but could not even serve as a guarantee for the economic and political gains which the working class and all the progressive forces had won in class and national-revolutionary struggles before the war.

The mighty post-war working-class and democratic movement was most closely linked with active participation by broad masses of people in the anti-fascist Resistance movement, whose programmes in the various countries covered a wide range of political and socio-economic demands. Thus, the programme of the National Council of the Resistance in France, adopted in March 1944, provided not only for measures to carry forward the armed fight against the invaders and the collaborationists. It also formulated concrete measures for the establishment of broad social and political democracy in post-war France, in particular, the elimination of the financial oligarchy, a return to the nation of the monopolised large-scale means of production, and workers' participation in the management of enterprises.

In the early post-war years, the struggle of the international working class was markedly *on the offensive*. This was

due both to the further weakening of the world capitalist system as a whole, as a result of the crushing defeat inflicted on German fascism and Japanese militarism, the knocking-out of more links from the imperialist chain and the establishment of democratic people's governments in a number of countries in Europe and Asia, and in the tangible change in the balance of forces in favour of the working class in most developed capitalist countries.

These countries were swept by a tide of mass strikes, with the US proletariat mounting a strike movement of great scope: in 1946, 280,000 railroad workers went on strike, paralysing all railroad transport in the USA, and in the steel industry the strike involved 750,000 workers. This action forced the US monopolists to concede considerable wage rises. A strike by 200,000 miners in 1947 for repeal of the anti-labour Taft-Hartley Act had an especial effect. A major victory for the American working-class movement was the strike by 500,000 steel workers in October 1949 which brought about better social insurance terms.

There was a marked upsurge of the proletarian movement in Britain, and a strengthening of solidarity between separate detachments of the working class. Strikes now and again broke out and were held despite action by Right-wing trade union leaders. A turning point in the post-war strike movement in Britain was the action by London transport workers in early 1947 for a reduction of the working week from 48 to 44 hours without pay cuts, and an annual 12-day paid holiday. The London dock workers' strike in June 1948 in support of Canadian seamen was a vivid illustration of the importance of labour solidarity. In 1951, the British proletariat's successful struggle forced the government to restore the workers' right to strike, which had been abolished during the war.

A heroic struggle was waged by the French proletariat. International importance attached to the strike by 300,000 miners in October 1948, and large-scale action by the working people of France in August 1953.

A most important feature in the development of the international working-class movement in the post-war period was the *growing influence of Communists among the working people*. The Soviet Union's decisive contribution to the crushing defeat of the nazi hordes and the Communists' courageous and selfless struggle against fascist enslavement were

instrumental in immensely enhancing the prestige of the first country of victorious socialism, and provided visual proof that the Communist Parties in the capitalist countries were the most consistent champions of democracy.

At the same time, there was a growth in the influence of other working-class organisations, including trade unions and (in some West European countries) Socialist Parties. The Social-Democrats' participation in the fight against the fascist invaders helped them to consolidate their positions and to assume power in many capitalist countries. Considering that the influence of the bourgeois parties had declined, it is no exaggeration to say that from 1945 to 1947 there were fresh palpable opportunities and prerequisites (as far as the internal conditions in some of these countries were concerned) for carrying out radical socio-economic and political changes, with the prospect of society's further advance towards socialism.

In these conditions, the working class was in need of unity in its ranks, both nationally and internationally. This unity was being forged during the war, when the Communists and the Social-Democrats—the leading political contingents of the proletariat in the capitalist countries—fought shoulder to shoulder arms in hand against the threat of fascist enslavement. There was growing conviction in the mass of working people that it was time to end the split among the workers and to set up united national and international organisations of the proletariat. In some instances, as in Norway in 1945, the Communist and the Social-Democratic Parties even negotiated on the establishment of a united party of the working class. The working people's urge for unity was embodied in the establishment in 1945 of the World Federation of Trade Unions.

Guided by the Leninist ideas of the unity of all anti-imperialist forces, the Communist Parties fought for the establishment of broad anti-monopoly coalitions, and consistently worked for joint action by various contingents of the proletariat. Cohesion of all the forces opposed to capitalism was the keynote of the congresses held by the Marxist-Leninist Parties in the developed capitalist countries in that period. Thus, the Tenth Congress of the French Communist Party in June 1945 put forward a concrete programme of action meeting the interests of the working class, the labouring peasants, the progressive intelligentsia, the urban petty bour-

geoisie and the peoples of the colonies. Maurice Thorez, outlining the new tasks of the proletarian vanguard in the post-war period, declared: "We shall continue tirelessly to repeat that the nation's unity is an absolutely necessary condition for our national revival. We shall continue tirelessly to repeat that France's resurgence is not the business of one party or a handful of statesmen, but a task which has to be tackled by millions of French men and women, by the whole nation."* The Italian Communists came out consistently for stronger joint action by all the Left forces.

In a number of countries, the Social-Democrats were forced by massive pressure to co-operate with the Communists. Thus, for instance, an agreement on joint action by the Communists and the Socialists was concluded in France in October 1946. In Italy, the pact on united action concluded between the Italian Communist Party and the Italian Socialist Party continued to be in effect.

The Marxist-Leninist Parties' flexible policy, in line with the national interest, won for the Communists massive support in parliamentary elections in the early post-war years. The Communist Parties had their representatives in the governments of 12 countries: Italy, France, Norway, Finland, Denmark, Austria, Belgium, Luxemburg, Iceland, Iran, Cuba and Chile.

Close co-operation between the various political contingents of the proletariat, especially the Communists' participation in the governments, helped to curb arbitrary action by the monopolies, and enabled the people in some capitalist countries to secure important democratic change. New and more democratic constitutions opening up definite possibilities for an offensive against monopoly capital were adopted in France and Italy. The working-class movement succeeded in wresting from the bourgeoisie considerable economic concessions on wages, social security and improved working conditions. The Communists consolidated their positions in the trade unions. Communist activity in a number of capitalist countries resulted in stronger positions for the Left forces in the trade union movement.

In some countries various industries were nationalised. From 1944 to 1947, coal industry, power stations and some

* *L'Humanité*, June 27, 1945.

steel mills, among other enterprises, were nationalised in Britain. Nationalisation covered almost 20 per cent of British industry. In that period, the French coal industry, power and gas-producing enterprises and several major automobile plants were also nationalised. True, the bourgeoisie exploited the nationalised enterprises for its own purposes, and there was an acute class struggle over these issues.

However, the proletariat was not yet in a position to bring about deep-going change affecting social and political structures in capitalist society. The Social-Democratic leadership's inconsistent and contradictory policy, and its refusal to take more resolute action to curb the monopoly bourgeoisie, together with a bent for class compromises and the anti-communist tenor of some of its actions, helped the ruling class gradually to stabilise its positions and then to take over the political initiative. Because the bourgeoisie managed to retain real levers of power in the economic sphere, it managed to use the incipient economic upswing as "evidence" that there was no need for the revolutionary forms of struggle, and spread the idea that capitalism was able to resolve the acute social problems.

This policy of the imperialist bourgeoisie, designed to divide the working people and weaken the revolutionary potential of working-class organisations, went hand in hand, in the atmosphere of a mounting cold war, with wild attacks against the Soviet Union and a fanning of anti-communist hysteria. Ruling bourgeois circles tried hard to drive a wedge between the Communists and the Socialists.

In the process, imperialist reaction pinned its hopes on the splitting policies of the Right-Socialist leaders. In 1947 they disrupted the co-operation with the Communists which had just been started, and this considerably weakened the forces of the working class and made it carry on a long and exhausting defensive struggle.

The rise of Right-wing tendencies in the Social Democratic movement had an adverse effect on the development of the working people's mass struggle in the leading capitalist countries, resulting in a split of the World Federation of Trade Unions (1949) and the restoration in 1951 of the Socialist International with a patently anti-communist platform. The Right-wing Social-Democrats, taking a hostile attitude to the Communists, in fact promoted the strengthening of state-monopoly capitalism and gave it a hand in its efforts

to "integrate" the working class into the capitalist system, thereby shouldering a grave historical responsibility.

In that period, the Communist Parties were the most consistent fighters for the interests of the working class.

However, let us add that the evolution of the Social-Democratic parties to the Right could not but have some negative effect on the mass working-class movement in some countries of the capitalist world, with the attendant disorientation and confusion among some sections of the working class. Bourgeois propaganda used this in an effort to prevent the growth of the strike movement and direct the working class along the way of "social partnership".

However, the period of some cooling of the class struggle could not last for long. Socio-economic processes within capitalist society inexorably led to an aggravation of the main contradictions of capitalism in the new conditions. Neither state interference in the economy aimed at getting the capitalist system to function properly, nor a more flexible strategy of social manoeuvring adopted by the ruling circles of the developed capitalist countries could help to abolish the operation of the historical law of the inevitable supplanting of capitalism by socialism, which the founders of scientific communism had discovered.

In the second half of the 1950s, a new stage opened in the general crisis of capitalism, which unfolded against the background of considerable successes scored by the strengthening world socialist system, and which went hand in hand with an unprecedented upswing in the social movements in the developed capitalist countries, further disintegration of the colonial periphery of imperialism, and growth of the national liberation struggle. These processes demanded of the international communist movement profound theoretical study.

The 20th Congress of the CPSU, guided by the Leninist theory of socialist revolution, made a comprehensive analysis of the changes in the deployment of forces in the international arena, and in the objective and subjective conditions of the class struggle in various parts of the globe. It worked out a line on questions of the international working-class and communist movement which, as the Meeting of Representatives of the Communist and Workers' Parties in 1960 stated, was "not only of great importance for the CPSU and communist construction in the USSR", but also

"initiated a new stage in the world Communist movement", promoting its further development on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.*

The main decisions of the Twentieth Congress of the CPSU were further developed at international communist forums, in the CPSU Programme and in the decisions of the 23rd Congress of the CPSU. In the new historical conditions, the French Communist Party, the Italian Communist Party and the other fraternal Communist Parties, developing Lenin's propositions on the diversity of forms of transition to socialism, came out even more vigorously and consistently for stronger unity of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries and all anti-imperialist forces of our day.

"A unity of goals is being objectively established," it was said at the Eighth Congress of the ICP, for instance, "between the working class fighting against the monopolies and for the overthrow of capitalism and the proletarian and semi-proletarian masses, and also the masses of small farmers in the countryside and a sizable section of the middle producing sections in the towns, which creates new possibilities for extending the system of alliances between the working class and the masses in the struggle for democratic and socialist renewal."**

While working for the mass ally, true Marxists-Leninists never forget about their own independent and strictly class proletarian policy, and do not allow any departures from Marxist-Leninist principles, ruling out any opportunistic adaptations to the attitudes and opinions of the petty-bourgeois sections. In this way, the Communist and Workers' Parties give a rebuff to the revisionists' attempts to dissolve the Communist vanguard in broad political coalitions.

The Leninist course followed by the international communist movement accounts for the militancy of the revolutionary contingents of the working class, as will be seen from the analysis of the present situation in the world given by the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow in June 1969. The activation of the

* *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, 1961, p. 80.

** *VIII Congresso del Partito Comunista Italiano. Atti e risoluzioni*. Editori Riuniti, 1957, p. 908.

working-class movement in the recent period, and the growing scale and new forms of the class struggle confirm the correctness of the Communist Parties' strategy aimed at consolidating the forces of the working-class and democratic movement against monopoly capital, the chief enemy.

The further success of the Leninist line for the unity of all anti-imperialist forces will largely depend on the effectiveness of practical activity by working-class organisations in face of the aggravation of the main contradiction of modern capitalism and their discovery of optimum intermediate goals and tasks whose realisation will serve as a bridgehead for going over to the revolutionary overthrow of the rule of the exploiters, and for truly socialist transformations.

TENDENCIES IN THE PROLETARIAT'S DEVELOPMENT

The working class is the most numerous and best organised class of modern capitalist society, which has powerful organisations and relies on fine traditions in the fight against capitalism. The arena of its class battles is above all the citadels of imperialism, the smashing of which is one of the main prerequisites for the world-wide triumph of socialism and communism.

Today, the development of the class struggle in these countries is determined by a number of very important internal and external factors.

The existence of the world socialist system, its successes in economic and social development, and its consistent struggle against the danger of a world thermonuclear war and the aggressive policy of imperialism is a tremendous accelerator of the liberation struggle against the oppression of capital. Among the internal factors exerting a manifold influence on the maturity, scope and forms of the class struggle are above all the development of state-monopoly tendencies and the advance of the scientific and technological revolution.

Under the impact of these objective conditions, the working class in the developed capitalist countries itself undergoes change. There is a growth in its numerical strength, skills, cultural level, and organisation. In the course of its class struggles it now and again wrests from the bourgeoisie

some concessions on wages, social legislation, and so on. The development of mass line production has changed the nature of the workers' labour, their requirements, and the conditions and way of life.

What influence have these changes on the condition of the working class as a whole? Do they reduce the revolutionary potential of the working class, as the Right-wing and "Left" adversaries of Leninism insist, or do they help to store up combustible material in the depths of bourgeois society, bringing nearer its replacement by another, higher social system? The right answer to these questions can be found with the help of the methodology Lenin used in studying the working class and the tendencies in its development.

In Marx's lifetime, the West European and North American working class was just taking shape as the leading class of capitalist society. A considerable part of social production was still accounted for by the petty bourgeoisie, above all, its most massive section—the peasantry—which (with the exception of Britain) constituted a majority of the population. The proletariat was developing "in breadth", with masses of ruined petty proprietors, who were still to shed their views, habits and ideology, being drawn into the midst of the workers. The proletariat of that period was almost entirely employed for work requiring hard manual labour, while mental labour remained the preserve of the ruling classes.

By the turn of the century, there was a sharp increase in the proportion of the proletariat in the industrialised capitalist countries. In the mid-19th century, there were 10 million proletarians in the leading capitalist countries; by the beginning of the 20th century, there were 30 million. In a number of his works, Lenin traced the tendency for this growth in the share of the working class in the population of the capitalist countries. Lenin said: "The main tendency of capitalism is to apply the sum total of labour-power in the national economy to production only after it has been sold and has been purchased by the employers."* This conclusion of Lenin's has been fully borne out by historical development. Compared with the beginning of the century, the number of industrial workers in the de-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 3, p. 580.

veloped capitalist countries is now almost four times greater; wage-workers, once a minority, are now a majority of the population.

Wage-Workers in the Working Population¹
(per cent)

USA	1947	77.5	1967	85.0
Britain	1948	90.8	1968	93.0
FRG	1950	70.8	1968	81.3
France	1954	64.9	1968	76.1
Italy	1951	61.0	1967	64.6
Japan	1955	38.6	1968	60.3
Canada	1961	82.4	1967	85.0

¹ Calculated by the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement, USSR Academy of Sciences, on the basis of UN statistics and national statistical year-books.

The other tendency noted by Lenin in the proletariat's development was connected with the qualitative change of its labour. While emphasising the vanguard role of factory workers—the most developed contingent of the working class—Lenin resolutely rejected the views of the Narodniks, who reduced the development of the working class in Russia to the emergence of the factory proletariat.*

Lenin disclosed the tendency for the section of the working class connected with mental labour to grow, on the one hand, and capitalist exploitation of workers by brain to intensify, on the other.

He showed that with the development of the productive forces, a section of the better educated and skilled workers emerges within the industrial proletariat itself, being required to handle "clever machines" and fill work places requiring both manual and mental labour. Initially, the share of this group of workers is very small; there is a very great gap between them and the bulk of the working class in terms of educational level, the complexity of operations performed, the cost of labour power, and pay scales. The further development of industrial production and the extension of its requirements have led to an increase in the share of this group within the ranks of the working people.

The general training of workers rose sharply. Production made it necessary and possible for a section of the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, pp. 313-18.

industrial proletariat to devote themselves to work by brain, despite all the obstacles created by the capitalist form of society. This is especially felt in the switch to partially automated production. The automated sectors of production have no use for unskilled labour and demand *highly skilled* manpower capable of adjusting and repairing machine-tools of various designs, that is, manpower with a high level of special and general training. There was a rapid growth in the proportion of repair and technical workers engaged largely in doing work by brain.

At the same time, Lenin noted another process: the conversion of the bulk of brain workers (salaried intellectuals and white-collar employees) into "dependent hirelings" of capital—which fact brought them closer to the proletariat.

Marx had remarked that a relatively small section of engineers and management personnel was in effect a part of the ruling class, which had a monopoly of education, culture and mental labour. While these persons did take part in production, they had a special status: they played the part of overseers, and in class battles usually took an anti-labour stand. Marx defined them as "a superior class of workmen, some of them scientifically educated, others brought up to a trade; *it is distinct from the factory operative class, and merely aggregated to it*" (emphasis by the authors).^{*} However, Marx already noted the contradictory nature of their position. In the process of capitalist production they were in effect brought together with the factory proletariat into a single *collective worker*, into a single production collective, *a living machine for the manufacture of products*. In the process, each of them enters into a contract of hire with the employer, that is, they all sell their labour power and receive their income in a form close to wages. All these work-people exchange "their labour *directly* for money as capital, and consequently directly reproduce, in addition to their wages, a surplus value for the capitalist".^{**} Lenin inquired into the social role and importance of those who did brain work for wages at a later stage of capitalist development and emphasised above all that "in all spheres of people's labour, capitalism

^{*} K. Marx, *Capital*, Vol. I, Moscow, 1959, p. 420.

^{**} K. Marx, *Theories of Surplus Value*, Part I, p. 399.

increases the number of *office and professional workers* with particular rapidity and makes a growing demand for intellectuals".* He wrote that large-scale capitalist production "requires non-manual employees to a degree rising in proportion to the increase in the use of machinery and the development of agricultural industries".**

Lenin's assessment of the class status of the technical intelligentsia and office workers had these additional features. He no longer referred them to the bourgeois class but said that they occupied a specific position among the other classes, and belonged in part to the bourgeoisie and in part to the wage-workers. This was a very important change in their class characteristic—the conversion of a whole social section into an intermediate layer between classes. Moreover, Lenin pointed to the tendency towards further change in the social status of the intelligentsia and office workers: "Capitalism increasingly deprives the intellectual of his independent position, converts him into a hired worker and threatens to lower his living standard."*** The extent of this involvement of workers by brain directly in production is illustrated by the USA, where engineers, technicians and white-collar workers make up over 40 per cent of the labour force in manufacturing. In the technically advanced industries, like arms manufacture, the percentage is even higher than that of workers by hand, and comes to 60 per cent. There are similar tendencies, even if with some lag, in other developed capitalist countries.

The switch to flow-line and semi-automated production marks a long step in bringing closer together the production conditions and economic requirements of the various class groups of the industrial proletariat. Take the changing working and living conditions among white-collar workers. First, the growing massiveness, combination and specialisation of production increases the flow of industrial and market information and produces industrial methods of processing it (mechanised accounting, electronic devices, cybernetics, etc.). Second, this results, both for white- and blue-collar workers, in competition from the machines. Third, in the most developed capitalist countries wages and living

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 4, p. 202.

** Ibid., Vol. 5, p. 221.

*** Ibid., Vol. 4, p. 202.

standards among a section of the white-collar workers now turn out to be even lower than the average for workers at comparable levels. Fourth, at this stage, their former function of "overseeing" the speed and quality of the workers' operations is being increasingly switched directly to various mechanisms, regulating the rhythm of operations, and workers themselves successively controlling each other.

These processes, which have an influence on the activity and social role of the bulk of the intelligentsia, white-collar workers and students do not in any sense obliterate these groups' functional-production, social and cultural features, but they do testify to a further polarisation of bourgeois society, and indicate that there is a growing similarity in the objective conditions, in which broad sections of the intelligentsia and the bulk of the working class have to exist.

* * *

The scientific and technological revolution and the development of state-monopoly capitalism have brought about deep changes in the structure and arrangement of social forces in the capitalist countries.

"The scientific and technological revolution accelerates the socialisation of the economy; under monopoly domination this leads to the reproduction of social antagonisms on a growing scale and in a sharper form. Not only have the long-standing contradictions of capitalism been aggravated, but new ones have arisen as well. This applies, in particular, to the contradiction between the unlimited possibilities opened up by the scientific and technological revolution and the road-blocks raised by capitalism to their utilisation for the benefit of society as a whole. Capitalism squanders national wealth, allocating for war purposes a great proportion of scientific discoveries and immense material resources. This is the contradiction between the social character of present-day production and the state-monopoly nature of its regulation. This is not only the growth of the contradiction between capital and labour, but also the deepening of the antagonism between the interests of the overwhelming majority of the nation and those of the financial oligarchy."*

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969, p. 19.*

As a result there is a considerable enlargement of the material prerequisites for a transition to socialism; the potential of a vastly explosive class protest is being built up deep within capitalist society. In this context, great importance attaches to the theoretical and practical study of the wage-workers' mentality. Leninism has at its disposal rich traditions in the materialist study of working-class mentality and awareness. The founders of scientific socialism always kept these problems in mind when developing the theory of socialist revolution and seeking for the most appropriate forms and methods of revolutionary struggle.

Lenin made a vast contribution to our knowledge of the basic regularities governing the development of mass proletarian consciousness. Even in his early works, he formulated a balanced conception of the proletariat's class consciousness.*

Later, on the eve of the first Russian revolution, Lenin observed that each of the transitions in the advance of the revolutionary movement "was prepared, on the one hand, by socialist thought working mainly in one direction, and on the other, by the profound changes that had taken place in the conditions of life and in the whole mentality of the working class."**

Indeed, the Leninist approach to the problems of proletarian consciousness is based precisely on this understanding of the ideological development of the working class as a coherent process of spontaneous psychological change and the acceptance and spread of the socialist ideology. The classic analysis of the dialectical relation between the workers' mentality and socialist ideology is given in Lenin's *What Is To Be Done?* where he wrote: "The working class spontaneously gravitates towards socialism; nevertheless, most widespread (and continuously and diversely revived) bourgeois ideology spontaneously imposes itself upon the working class to a still greater degree."***

Lenin showed that the working-class mentality which developed spontaneously, is liable to be influenced both by socialist and by bourgeois ideology. Thus, bourgeois influence may rest on "the common striving of all workers to secure from the government measures for alleviating the

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 2, pp. 112-14.

** Ibid., Vol. 8, p. 211.

*** Ibid., Vol. 5, p. 386.

distress to which their condition gives rise, but which do not abolish that condition, i.e., which do not remove the subjection of labour to capital.”* Only by carrying on a purposeful struggle against bourgeois ideology can socialist ideology make the “gravitation towards socialism” gain the upper hand in the proletarian’s mind and overcome the spontaneous tendency to accept capitalist relations.

Lenin repeatedly turned to the problems of working-class consciousness in connection with the pressing tasks of the revolutionary struggle and gave a profound explanation of the importance of the masses’ own experience of class struggle in their ideological and intellectual development, as he studied the most important socio-psychological aspects of the mass revolutionary movement. In Lenin’s writings on the problems of the international communist movement a study of the mentality of the masses became, in fact, an important political task. The Communists, he wrote in 1920, “must *soberly* [to] follow the *actual* state of the class-consciousness and preparedness of the entire class (not only of its communist vanguard), and of all the *working people* (not only of their advanced elements)”.** In his theses on the main tasks of the Second Congress of the Comintern, Lenin noted that “we must learn to approach the masses with particular patience and caution so as to be able to understand the distinctive features in the mentality of each stratum, calling, etc., of these masses”***

Lenin’s ideas on the various aspects of inquiry into the consciousness of the working class remain fully meaningful in our day, and are used by the Communist Parties in working out their strategy and tactics, and the methods of their work among the masses. Analysis and summing up of experience accumulated in the concrete study of the mentality of the masses, of the present-day “psychological make-up” of the working class, are an important component part of the ideological and theoretical activity of the international communist movement.

The psychological make-up of the working class is an aggregate of the feelings and ideas, rules of life and ideals, aspirations and requirements which are typical of the bulk of the workers and which determine their social behaviour,

* Ibid., p. 387.

** Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 58.

*** Ibid., p. 192.

and degree of activity in the class struggle. The mentality of a class differs from its ideology above all in that in it spontaneous and emotional responses by the masses to social realities are of relatively greater importance. For its part, ideology takes stock of the needs and interests of the class in theoretical terms, in the form of a more or less coherent system of views of existing society and a comprehensively substantiated programme of practical action.

From this it does not follow in any sense that the mass consciousness of the working class is in itself "purely psychological or stripped of ideology", as many bourgeois and revisionist sociologists insist, proclaiming that social psychology is "independent" of ideology. The fact is that any ideology has its socio-psychological roots, while the notions, ideas and conceptions worked out by ideology penetrate into the mass mind and become a fact of social psychology. Failure to understand this dialectical relation between psychology and ideology results, on the one hand, in a limitation of social psychology to the sphere of the sensual and the subconscious, and on the other, to a denial that ideology exerts an active influence on the socio-psychological make-up of classes and other social entities.

Changes in objective living conditions result in changes in the workers' mentality, but these are reflected in the mind not only directly, but also through the prism of the rules, stereotypes and values worked out by various ideologies and variously spread among the masses. Bourgeois ideology does not remain indifferent to the new socio-psychological tendencies developing in the mass mind: it seeks to monitor these tendencies and to give them a vent which helps to strengthen the capitalist system. It is the task of Marxist-Leninist science to bring out the in-depth content of such tendencies and thoroughly to clarify the influence which bourgeois ideology exerts (or tries to exert) on the forms of their expression. This is the only approach which helps to understand the possibilities of developing the proletariat's consistent class consciousness, which are created by its present psychological make-up, and the lines in the ideological work of the Marxists-Leninists which most successfully translate these possibilities into reality.

A study of the consciousness of the modern working class must take account of the characteristic changes today in the proletariat's objective living conditions, changes in

living standards, structure of requirements and the whole social environment. These changes develop at a relatively fast pace and are variously reflected in the minds of working people in different sections, now and again producing contradictory socio-psychological tendencies. The important thing to bear in mind is that the anti-Marxist theories of the "deproletarianisation" and "embourgeoisement" of the working class thrive on these contradictions. The ruling bourgeoisie seeks to use the changes in mass mentality to undermine the foundation of the proletariat's class consciousness, and to spread in the working class ideas alien to its basic interests. A concrete Marxist-Leninist analysis of mass mentality is therefore one of the most important conditions for successfully combating bourgeois ideology.

There is nothing fundamentally new in the fact that the proletariat's requirements grow and the structure of its consumption changes. Back in the late 19th century Lenin noted that "the development of capitalism inevitably entails a rising level of requirements for the entire population, including the industrial proletariat.... This law of increasing requirements has manifested itself with full force in the history of Europe—compare, for example, the French proletariat of the end of the eighteenth and of the end of the nineteenth centuries, or the British worker of the 1840s and of today."* A comparison of the worker of the 1960s and the worker of the 1920s or the 1930s will apparently produce the same picture.

The material basis for satisfying the new requirements are the concessions on wages which the working class succeeds in wresting from the bourgeoisie as mass production is expanded and labour productivity goes up. In this process, the development of consumer credit has a substantial part to play. A highly characteristic feature in the evolution of the workers' material conditions is their growing installment debt, which shows that the purchasing power of the working class lags markedly behind the increase of its needs. Most workers' families live on extremely tight budgets, of which the natural psychological consequence is a sense of insecurity in the sphere of consumption, upsetting the worker's moral equilibrium and saddling him with endless worries about money.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 106.

In these conditions, neither the growth in living standards, nor the changes in the structure of consumption help to eliminate the causes of the workers' discontent with their wages. Another thing to bear in mind is that not all groups of the working class by far have even a limited opportunity of expanding their consumption. The average statistics cover up a wide spectrum of living conditions. Hundreds of thousands of working people in the lower income brackets live in severe privation. Such "poverty areas" are known to exist in all industrialised capitalist countries, and involve considerable segments of their working class.

It should be borne in mind that the workers' growing requirements tend sharply to increase their intolerance of any sign of social oppression, which capitalism itself insists is "becoming a thing of the past", but which in fact is built into the social system. The mentality of a considerable segment of the workers today was shaped during the relatively favourable economic outlook of the 1950s and 1960s, of high-level employment, and some rise in living standards. The result is that the working class today is sensitive and averse to any potential or actual loss of jobs owing to capitalist rationalisation of production or slack business, or the ruling circles' attempts to reduce the purchasing power of wages, to whittle away social insurance benefits, and so on. The fact is that, despite its state-monopoly modernisation, present-day capitalism is incapable of providing sound guarantees of economic and social stability, and this is clearly seen from the dynamics of unemployment in the various capitalist countries. Today, broad sections of the working people are least of all inclined to accept poverty and privation as something predestined. That is why, in the present conditions, any marked deepening of contradictions in the capitalist economy is latent with a fresh growth in the militant mood of the masses.

Concessions on wages which the workers wring from the capitalists and the state foster among them the awareness that their living standard depends on the balance of forces between the working class and the bourgeoisie. Hence the awareness of the need for collective action as the principal means of maintaining and raising their living standard. The mounting massive strike movement in most capitalist countries shows quite clearly that the theories about the class struggle dying down and strikes being on the way out

under modern capitalism are quite untenable. At the same time, the forms and trends of economic struggle are a reflection of the changes taking place in the minds of the working masses, in particular, their attitude to various aspects of the living standard. The motives behind their protest against capitalist exploitation are enhanced by some relatively new factors arising under the scientific and technological revolution and state-monopoly capitalism.

In most capitalist countries, the level of working-class consumption is now largely determined by the state-monopoly measures designed to regulate incomes. These measures are being widely used to press down the working people's living standard, but they are also forced recognition of the objective criteria of "normal" and "fair" wages (for instance, the setting of an official minimum wage rate depending on the price level, payment of social security benefits depending on size of family, and so on). This, even if only nominal, recognition that there exists some kind of social standard for wages intensifies the working people's intolerance of low or inadequate living standards. Not so long ago, many workers still regarded unemployment or a decline in the living standard under the impact of the price spiral as something of a natural calamity resulting from economic processes beyond any control. There is no room for this kind of thinking where employment and the movement of wages are regulated on the scale of the whole state. The working people connect every aspect of their material condition directly with the policy of the capitalist state and the monopolies. More and more often the working class demands a change in the general nature of this policy when launching its mass militant actions: the working people seek not only this or that re-instatement or another wage rise, but strive to secure the right to work and guaranteed living standards.

At the same time, it is ever more typical for broad sections of the workers (including those in the higher brackets) to protest against the growing inequality of incomes, and the inordinate rise in capitalist profits, which are out of all proportion to the growth of real wages. The workers do not fail to notice the sharp increase in labour productivity under the impact of the current scientific and technological revolution. The mass of proletarians are increasingly aware of the contrast between the real condition of the

working class and the tremendous possibilities for improving its living and working conditions created by modern productive forces. This awareness is quickened by the nervous and mental overstrain caused by the growing intensification of labour. The workers see more and more evidence that the numerous technical improvements, while boosting the volume of output, fail to lighten working conditions.

The economic demands of the workers are increasingly stimulated by a clearer understanding of how the mechanism of capitalist exploitation works. In the workers' minds, the problem of raising real wages is more immediately connected with the amount of work and the new value created by their labour. *The specific feature of these socio-psychological shifts is that they have been developing against the background of the relatively high or growing level of consumption.* Some 50 or 30 years ago, the workers' economic struggle was largely stimulated by elementary vital necessities, and was a struggle against material poverty. Today, among the active participants in it are workers who are not immediately faced with hunger or poverty; they are in fact fighting not only for a satisfaction of the growing range of their material needs, but also for a change in the whole complex of the social conditions in which these needs are realised.

In the major strike battles of the last few years, such as the French working people's strike in May and June 1968, and strike action by workers in Italy, Japan, the USA, Britain and other countries, there was massive support for the demand for shorter working hours without wage-cuts, guarantees for the living standard achieved (nominal wages tied to the rising cost of living, reduction in the share of various bonuses and increase of minimum fixed wage rates), and higher wages tied to rising productivity and profits. Living standards expressed in absolute terms have ceased to be the main or the decisive factor behind the intensity of the workers' protests against capitalist exploitation. In the day-to-day economic struggle of the working class, an ever greater part is played by its desire to restrict the arbitrary action of the capitalist state and the monopolies, to bridge the income gap, to use the fruits of economic and technological progress for its own benefit, and to put an end to their uncontrolled appropriation by those who own industry. The protest against material insecurity is clearly growing over

into a protest against social inequality, into a struggle for greater rights and social dignity of the working class. Consequently, the present stage of the economic struggle creates substantial socio-psychological prerequisites for drawing broad masses of working people into the movement for radical social change.

The experience of the working-class movement shows that there is nothing automatic about implementing these prerequisites and converting the spontaneous social protest of the masses into active democratic and socialist consciousness. Lenin's conclusion that "the *spontaneous* development of the working-class movement leads to its subordination to bourgeois ideology"* retains its full meaning in our day.

Present-day capitalism has been raising fresh and specific obstacles to hinder the development of the class consciousness of the proletariat. Displaying considerable flexibility on material concessions to some sections of the working people, it seeks to reduce the class struggle to a heart-to-heart bargaining between the workers and the employers, making it a "normal" element of the existing system. Being incapable of eliminating the root causes of the working-class economic struggle, capitalism seeks to moderate its anti-capitalist, ideological-psychological and socio-political content.

One of the most widespread ways of exerting influence on the minds of proletarians is to implant the "consumer" mentality in their midst so as to divert their attention from their socio-political interests and their status in society and production.

It is a fact that the philistine consumer mentality has an influence on some sections of the working class, and it would be wrong to see it only as resulting from some part of the working class being infected with alien notions and standards. It should also be seen as a possible psychological response to some aspects of the social condition of the working class. The worker's joys are few, and more often than not he finds his job a humdrum affair. His prospects for the future are uncertain. He learns, as he starts in his trade, that there is not much chance of seriously improving his skills, developing his mind or deriving satisfaction from his work. In these conditions, the worker frequently regards

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 384.

the "consumer standard" as a means of securing a "human existence" after working hours to compensate him for the humiliation of the dehumanised conditions of capitalist production. When the individual's urge for self-expression and initiative not dictated "from above" is suppressed in the sphere of labour, it seeks to vent itself in the sphere of leisure. The comforts of home, television and week-end outings produce the illusion that man is free, that he is the master of his time and the captain of his life. This is a vibrant need for the worker who is keenly aware of his subordinate and unequal social status in production, who has no option before him, who is at the bottom of a long hierarchy of superiors, and who feels that his life has been cast into a final mould.

Consequently, the consumer urge among a section of the workers is a specific expression of their deeper spiritual requirements, which are a product of their social conditions. It is of course a twisted and obscured way of satisfying this urge, and instead of making the individual free it empties his life and puts him in even greater bondage.

It would be quite wrong to assume that the current evolution in the workers' living conditions tends to establish only the philistine consumer mentality, for this would ignore the dialectical nature of the evolution and the fresh possibilities it produces for enhancing the consciousness and activity of the working masses.

One of the most essential effects of the spreading social change in the capitalist countries is that the social status of the working class grows increasingly contradictory. On the one hand, the gains of the working-class movement and the advances of the scientific and technological revolution tend to take the workers by hand out of their traditional social and cultural isolation and humiliating condition, as will be seen from the spread of new forms of consumption and leisure, some growth in the workers' educational levels, greater social prestige of working-class trade union and political organisations, and wider day-to-day contacts between workers and other social sections. These contacts are established with the changing structure of the working class and the massive influx of technical specialists and white-collar workers into production, all of which helps to break down the social and psychological barriers between the workers and the technical intelligentsia.

The modern worker, especially the young one, very often has much the same way of life, education, and cultural make-up, has a similar circle of friends and mixes with similar people as the brain-worker, who represents the mass of the intelligentsia. The unprecedented spread of the mass media gives the workers access to the same sources of cultural, social and political information that are available to other social sections. The workers' old sense of social ostracism tends to be blunted.

However, the emergence of the working class from its earlier socio-cultural isolation and release from extreme material privation have done nothing to modify basically its social status. It remains an exploited class, given the least opportunity in life, and the hardest hit by social oppression and dependence. In the past, the proletarian felt his inequality in every sphere of life: in production, and in material and cultural consumption. The workers' present way of life and cultural level, with all the outward signs of "a rise to the top", clashes sharply with their actual status in production and society. This contradiction is having a growing effect on the requirements and aspirations of the working class, seen as a system.

As the workers' cultural level rises, they take a more demanding view of the social aspects and content of their work. There is ever sharper protest against work that is coercive, ignores the workers' initiative, alienates him from the goals of production, and results in the trampling of his human dignity by the whole system of capitalist rule.

In modern large-scale mechanised production, most working people have to do work that is monotonous and uninspiring. The current phase of the scientific and technological revolution and the attendant automation of production have not brought any essential change to this situation. While the semi-literate labourer, engrossed in the struggle for a bare livelihood, mostly cares little about the work he has to do, the more educated and better paid worker finds it much harder to do work that is not varied and creative. Polls taken in different countries invariably show that the broadest sections of the working class keenly feel the need for work that is more meaningful and calls for more thinking.

This urge impels the workers to improve their skills so as to obtain not only better paid but more exciting jobs. But because in the conditions of present-day production this

requires the capitalists to make greater outlays on additional training, the worker finds himself facing some high hurdles. Thus, from 1959 to 1963, only about 4 per cent of the workers in France were able to receive additional occupational training.

Generations of workers had seen their indigence, their special type of work and way of life as the most obvious mark of their class. Today, growing importance is attached by masses of workers to such aspects of the working-class condition as inequality of opportunity, especially in education, intellectual content of life, and prospects for occupational advancement. The modern worker is aware that he belongs to a deprived social group, put in unequal and captive conditions, most strikingly exemplified by low social mobility, and scant opportunities for his children to obtain a higher education and improve their social standing.

These feelings and needs of the workers have a common socio-psychological basis: the urge for a richer spiritual life, greater personal freedom and independence, and growing intolerance of social inequality. The example of the socialist countries, where everyone, regardless of social origin and occupational status, has broad possibilities for education and cultural development, is very important in intensifying these aspirations and giving the workers an awareness of them.

What then is the influence exercised by the workers' changing requirements and social notions on their class consciousness and their attitude to capitalism and the class struggle? In answering these questions account must be taken both of the unequal development of these socio-psychological tendencies in different sections of the working class, and the dissimilarity of the forms in which these tendencies are expressed, together with the possibility of their exerting a varied influence on the workers' socio-political behaviour.

The social policy and propaganda of monopoly capital speculate on the material and moral needs of the working class. For instance, a key principle of the so-called "human relationship" policy applied by management at many modern capitalist enterprises is to go through the motions of showing concern and respect for the workers, encouraging their initiatives and interest in production, and in general creating an atmosphere of democratic "partner-

ship". With the rapid development of new industries, and growing demand for skilled labour, the more successful enterprises give some workers advanced training for higher jobs. This is widely advertised and presented as a "policy of education and advancement" allegedly pursued from humanistic considerations "in the interests of the personnel". This propaganda, and to an even greater extent illusions about "fresh opportunities" allegedly opening up before the workers in the growth industries, foster hopes of occupational advancement which must result from the workers' own "effort" and "application". The relatively privileged status of workers in such industries and enterprises (both in terms of material condition and opportunities for "advancement") helps to spread the idea that the interests of the working people and the owners of the enterprises are compatible and in fact identical.

At the same time, the growth of the workers' needs promotes their class consciousness, as experience of the working-class movement in some countries shows.

Thus, in France and Italy the Communist Parties enjoy the widest and strongest influence, which has been growing in the industrial areas where the average of workers' skills, and educational and cultural levels are relatively higher. Greater numbers of skilled and more educated workers become Party and trade union activists. These workers have a higher intellectual level and higher living standards, and this is why more of them succeed in making a psychological escape from gross material strivings and worries than the less cultured and lower-paid workers. Let us bear in mind that the worker's political consciousness and social activity largely depend on the extent of his spiritual requirements.

This connection between the level of requirements, living standards and class consciousness is determined by the social conditions of the proletariat. The worker is impelled to take an active part in the class struggle by the hopelessness of his personal prospects in life, lack of satisfaction in his work, and the highly restricted possibilities of occupational and social advancement, for ultimately it is social activity and work in the Party or the trade union that genuinely goes to make his life richer and give it a clear purpose and meaning. Consequently, the development of spiritual and intellectual needs may act as a powerful factor in shap-

ing a militant collectivist consciousness. At the same time, it helps the mass to gain an awareness of purposes in the struggle which go beyond the purely economic framework.

The last few years have been marked by a considerable growth in the political activity of the working class, a process which is above all expressed in massive action against the bourgeois governments' anti-labour measures. At the same time, there has been a marked stimulation of interest among the mass of workers in broader domestic and foreign policy problems, and of their active opposition to the whole line of the ruling circles.

The changes in the workers' political mood assume different forms even where the organised working-class movement is headed by men mainly toeing the reactionary political line of the ruling circles. In this context, it is highly symptomatic that most British trade unions were opposed to the Labour Government's domestic and foreign policy, and that the labour movement in the USA has been split. Let us recall that this split was largely caused by differences over Vietnam and a number of key domestic policy issues. In that country, where the working class does not have its own massive political organisation, withdrawal from the leading labour centre testifies to grass-roots dissatisfaction over the stand taken by the AFL-CIO leadership, and to workers' resistance to the policies of the "military-industrial complex".

The changing structure of the workers' needs and their rising intellectual level produce substantial changes in the *content* of mass consciousness. These processes reduce the role of the spontaneous, purely emotional protest and develop an urge for conscious, deliberate participation in the class struggle, and for effective and rationalised defence of their class interests.

Leninism believes that one of the main sectors in developing class, socialist consciousness is the intellectual and cultural growth of the mass itself, which enables the workers to "acquire the knowledge of their age and develop that knowledge".*

The growing role of the rational element in the workers' outlook helps to narrow the gap between the spontaneous-psychological and the scientific-ideological levels of their

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 5, p. 384.

class consciousness. Present-day changes in working-class mentality create fresh opportunities to develop the workers' awareness precisely along the lines anticipated by Lenin.

Realisation of these opportunities depends on the ideological and political level of the massive working-class movement. Present-day reality fully bears out Lenin's well-known proposition that the worker's consciousness is not determined only by his spontaneously shaped mentality: it may assume various orientations depending on which ideology penetrates deeper into the mass. The socio-psychological tendencies typical of the modern working class—protest against social oppression and the urge to live a full-blooded and truly human life—are very differently refracted in the varied socio-political and ideological atmosphere. Such tendencies are more easily embodied in conscious struggle for broad social aims, where in virtue of specific historical experience and working-class traditions, a large part of the workers share revolutionary and socialist convictions and where there are massive Marxist-Leninist Parties. Wherever reformism and the utilitarian trade union "economic" approach dominate the ideology of the working-class movement, these tendencies quite often appear as a vague urge for a "real life", and as spontaneous protest which, failing to find an outlet in conscious action, frequently turns into social apathy and disillusionment in the purposes of collective struggle. Many bourgeois sociologists insist that this is an "irreversible" process of disintegration of the proletarian consciousness. Actually, however, it is often an expression of the crisis of mass trade-unionist awareness, and of the inability and unwillingness of reformist ideology and policy to give form and expression to the working people's present needs.

The experience of the Communist Parties in the industrialised capitalist countries fully shows the present opportunities for bringing together the goals and ideas of the organised working-class movement and the needs of the broadest masses. This is best shown by the programmes for genuine democratisation of socio-political life put forward by the Communist Parties.

The Communists believe that real democracy implies active participation by the working people in production, and social and political affairs. The social changes for which the Communist Parties are working—democratic plan-

ning, nationalisation of the key industries, workers' control in production and the whole economic sphere, abolition of social barriers in education and culture, and utmost extension of democratic rights and freedoms—are designed to facilitate such participation. A programme for real democracy is an ideological and political expression of the most promising tendencies in the mass consciousness, and raises the working people's urge for an intelligent, meaningful and socially active life to the level of rationalised practical action.

The Communists believe that the struggle for democracy is the main component part of the struggle for socialism. This is true not only in the sense that elimination of the power of the monopolies and subsequent democratic changes create the necessary social and political conditions for advancing the struggle for socialism. One other thing is equally important. Consistent democracy is inconceivable without abolishing man's exploitation of man, and one of the key goals of socialism is to make real massive participation in running social affairs. Accordingly, the socialist consciousness of the masses grows from the democratic consciousness, and includes as an organic part the extended and concretised democratic ideal.

The present stage in the development of the working-class mentality tends to foster needs and urges which cannot be satisfied in a society where the life of the working people is geared to the interests of the monopoly oligarchy. As these strivings acquire the psychological importance of vital needs for ever greater masses of people, new conditions mature for the shaping of massive revolutionary consciousness. The ideology and policy of the revolutionary working-class movement have a decisive part to play in this process. By developing the working man's urge to secure freedom of development in every sphere of social life, they draw him into conscious and consistent struggle for social progress and for the emancipation of his class.

CHANGES IN THE MASS WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT

Leninism regards the revolutionary process in the capitalist world as a combination of proletarian class battles and massive anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist movements.

Because capitalist development is uneven, there can be no harmoniously balanced or even development of the working-class movement in the various capitalist countries. In a talk with Clara Zetkin in 1921, Lenin said that it was necessary "to put an end to the Leftist illusions that the world revolution is ceaselessly advancing at its initial stormy pace, that we are on the crest of a second revolutionary wave, and that the possibility of securing victory for our banner depends exclusively on the Party's will and activity".*

At the same time, analysing the principal tendencies and prospects in the proletariat's struggle, Lenin repeatedly referred to the inflamed state of the class contradictions in the citadels of imperialism, the relatively better organisation of the working class, its high consciousness and activity,** and its vast experience in the fight against reaction.

The pillars of bourgeois-monopoly domination have been repeatedly shaken by large-scale class battles in the leading capitalist countries. That is what happened in the post-October revolutionary crisis of 1918-23. Another massive tide of the working-class and anti-fascist movement swept the capitalist world in the 1930s, in the period of the Popular Front. There was a mighty upswing of the general democratic movements and the proletariat's class struggle in the 1940s, in the years of anti-fascist Resistance, and also after the crushing defeat of nazism in the Second World War.

Lenin emphasised, however, that it was harder to start the socialist revolution in the industrialised capitalist states.*** He said one of the reasons was that the working class in these countries faced an enemy who was not only in possession of a powerful arsenal of economic, political and ideological means of exerting influence on the masses, but who because of his vast experience made skilful use of various

* *On Lenin. Reminiscences of Foreign Contemporaries*, p. 45.

** These conclusions of Lenin's remain true to this day. Let us recall that since the Second World War, the membership of the Communist Parties only in the capitalist countries of Europe has increased five-fold: from 500,000 to 2,500,000. In the industrialised capitalist countries, tens of millions of workers are organised in trade unions or are members of other mass working people's organisations.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 98.

ways of splitting the working class. Lenin wrote that the monopoly bourgeoisie of the USA and Britain is "unequalled anywhere in the world in the art of deceiving, corrupting and bribing the workers".* Referring to contemporary capitalism in the West, Lenin said that the shell of monopoly capitalism holding the whole of society was "unfortunately made of the best steel, and hence cannot be broken by the efforts of *any* . . . chicken."**

The intensity of the anti-monopoly struggle, the level of the proletariat's class consciousness, and the influence of its revolutionary vanguard on the masses are not alike in the various imperialist states. They depend on the concrete balance of forces in each country, the specific features of its historical development and working-class traditions, the influence of the revolutionary massive Marxist-Leninist Party, on the one hand, and of reformist organisations on the other, and so on.

In countries like France and Italy, where the political and social contradictions are highly acute, the massive working-class and general democratic movement has been developing under the leadership of strong Communist Parties. In other countries (FRG, Britain and most of the Scandinavian states) the class struggle has been taking somewhat different forms. For many reasons, the largest working-class organisations there are under the preponderant influence of social-reformism.

The conditions of the mass movements and the working people's class struggle are especially difficult in the USA, the chief imperialist country, where the proletariat is confronted by the strongest and most reactionary imperialist bourgeoisie. At the same time, for historical reasons the US labour movement has lagged ideologically and politically. For many years, it was not just social-reformism, but bourgeois reformism that has been the dominant ideology among the majority of labour leaders in the USA, where there is no massive Social-Democratic party.

On the whole, *prerequisites for a fresh powerful upswing in the class struggle of the proletariat and the broad masses of the working people in the main imperialist countries have matured* at the present stage of the general crisis of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 12, p. 373.

** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 340.

capitalism. The world Communist forum in June 1969 declared that "socio-political crises are breaking out in many countries, in the course of which the working masses are becoming aware of the necessity of deep-going and decisive changes".*

Among the most important features of the present stage of the working-class and democratic movement in the industrialised capitalist countries are the following:

- a much greater scope of the strike and other mass action; some new forms of struggle and a higher level of demands;

- a growth of joint action by various detachments of the working people and their organisations, especially the trade unions, above all in the struggle for socio-economic demands;

- a broader social composition of those taking part in the class battles and anti-monopoly action, involvement of new groups and categories of the population (with a larger proportion of the non-unionised workers, engineers and technicians, members of the middle urban and rural sections; of great importance, in particular, is the ever wider participation, in the conditions of the scientific and technological revolution, by white-collar workers, as in France, Italy and the USA);

- a closer interlacing of social, economic and political aspects of the struggle, and ever precise co-ordination of general democratic and proletarian, socialist slogans.

All this is manifested today not only in the mature revolutionary working-class movement, but even in the flare-up of the student movement taking various forms, and in the radicalisation of the intelligentsia (alongside the workers and the peasants).

The large scale and the bitterness of the working people's class battles against the policy of monopoly capital demonstrate the greater role of the working class and its organisations in the socio-economic and political life of the capitalist world. An analysis of the anti-monopoly battles bears out the conclusion drawn by the Communist and Workers' Parties that, "*in the citadels of capitalism the working class, as recent events have shown, is the principal driving force*

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 19.

*of the revolutionary struggle, of the entire anti-imperialist, democratic movement".**

The changing scale and massiveness of the strike struggle most vividly testify to the sharpening of the social contradictions in present-day bourgeois society. In his speech at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969, L. I. Brezhnev emphasised: "The sharpening of the class struggle in the capitalist world is an inexorable fact. Suffice it to say that from 1960 to 1968 a total of over 300 million persons took part in strike struggles, as compared with 150 million over the preceding 14 years."**

The class struggle has assumed especially great scope in recent years. Here is how the working people's strike movement in the capitalist countries has advanced (including short strikes and other mass action).

Numbers Involved in the Strike Movement in the Capitalist Countries
(mln. persons)

	Capitalist world	Industrialised countries
1958	26	13
1959	36	16
1960	56	44
1961	51	42
1962	55	41
1963	57	42
1964	56	35
1965	36	20
1966	44	27
1967	46	30
1968	57	43

These data show that the greater part of the working people's strike action in the capitalist world occurs in the industrialised countries.

Especially great importance attaches to large-scale national strikes staged by the working class. In the last decade, there were over 250 such strikes in the capitalist world, which is several times more than in the preceding decade.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 24.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 148-49.

Emphasising the vast political and national importance of the proletariat's major general strikes, Lenin wrote back in 1912 that, "the Russian workers were *the first in the world* to develop the strike struggle on the mass scale that we witnessed in 1905-1907.... The Russian workers owe their leading role not to greater strength, better organisation or higher development compared with the workers in Western Europe, but to the fact that so far Europe has not gone through great national crises, with the proletarian masses taking an independent part in them. When such crises do set in, mass strikes in Europe will be even more powerful than they were in Russia in 1905."*

In the conditions of present-day state-monopoly capitalism, independent large-scale action by the proletariat, together with the struggle of its allies, results in a growth of nation-wide socio-political crises. Not only objective but also subjective prerequisites are taking shape for the working class, in alliance with other democratic forces, delivering decisive blows and winning the coming battles against monopoly capitalism.

Among the most important class battles in the industrialised capitalist countries in the recent period were the following:

- the mammoth strike in May and June 1968, involving 10 million French working people, was an expression of the deep social and political crisis in the country;

- the November 1968 strike, involving 12 million Italian working people, which aggravated the drawn-out government crisis and opened a phase of stern class struggle in Italy; the February 1969 general strike involving 18 million persons; the strike of the autumn of 1969;

- the "spring offensive" by 14 million Japanese working people in 1968;

- the heroic strikes by the miners of Asturias, Spain, in the autumn of 1968 and in early 1969;

- the intensified strike struggle in the USA; there were 4,950 strikes in 1968, with 47 million man-days;

- large-scale strikes in the FRG in September 1969.

* * *

The characteristic new aspects of the present-day working-class movement in Western Europe were most pro-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, pp. 83-84.

nounced in France. Lenin wrote: "The French people are probably among the most experienced, most politically conscious, most active and responsive."^{*}

Long experience brought the French working class and its vanguard organisations to the conclusion that there was need resolutely to invigorate the movement. The general miners' strike in 1963 in which all the miners' federations belonging to various trade union centres acted together, was supported by virtually the whole working population. The congresses of the leading trade union centres in 1963, after the miners' victorious struggle, revealed the urge to overcome the division in the trade union movement and to take joint action.

The strong surge for unity and the mounting struggle of the working class against the policy of the monopolies forced the leadership of the reformist French Democratic Confederation of Labour (FDCL) to accept the conclusion in January 1966 of a joint-action agreement on the basis of common demands with the General Confederation of Labour (GCL). Joint action by trade unions belonging to the GCL and the FDCL repeatedly received support from other trade unions and helped the working-class movement in France to enter the phase of nation-wide action involving millions of the working people. Among the milestones on the great way which led up to the sharp political crisis of 1968 were the general strikes and manifestations of May 17, 1966; November 23, 1966; February 1, 1967, and May 17, 1967; united-action week in October 1967, and united-action day on December 13, 1967.

In May and June 1968, the working class moved into the forefront of French political life as a mighty organised force, operating along two main lines: struggle for the interests of the proletariat itself and support for the legitimate demands of the students who fell victim to police repression.

Throughout the ten years of the Fifth Republic, there was growing discontent in the working class with the ruling circles' socio-economic policy. The May-June events were focussed on the large bill of demands presented by the working people to the government and the employers. There was above all the demand for higher pay for milli-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 483.

ons of working people receiving less than 600 francs a month (which was below the subsistence minimum). The strikers demanded a general wage rise, arguing that from 1958 French production had gone up 63 per cent, and labour productivity 50-60 per cent, while wages and salaries for many categories of working people continued to fluctuate round the 1957 level.

The demand for abolition of zonal distinctions in wages went hand in hand with the demand for return to the legitimate 40-hour working week without wage cuts (in France the working week averages 46.7 hours). The demand for guaranteed employment merged with the demand for repeal of the emergency government decrees cutting back social benefits, which hit 34 million persons, mainly workers and members of their families. Those were among the main causes behind the explosion of the working people's indignation. During the impressive demonstrations on May Day 1968, the working class and its allies made known these and other anti-monopoly demands.

At the same time, working-class organisations closely followed the development of the conflict between the students and the authorities at Paris University, in the Latin Quarter. The GCL and its organisations declared their solidarity with the students and teachers fighting for a democratic system of education and against the reactionary policy of the authorities. The shortage of student grants, hostels, student canteens, laboratories and equipment, and of teaching staffs; the low level of instruction, which fell short of the present state of science and technology; class segregation, which prevented young people from poor working-class and peasant families from going on to university; and the impossibility of securing satisfaction of their legitimate demands—all this brought about an explosion of dissatisfaction at the university. The university events in May 1968 were sparked off by high-handed police action against a student meeting at the Sorbonne, France's oldest university.

By staging a general 24-hour strike and protest demonstration on May 13, the organised working class gave the students decisive support. Strikes spread across the country, assuming acute forms from the outset. On May 14, 1968, 2,000 metal workers at a Sud Aviation plant (Loire Inférieure Department), who had been carrying on an intense struggle

against the management for three weeks, took over the plant. The workers then took over at the Renault Motor Works at Cléon, Mens, Flines and Boulogne-Billancourt. Following suit, the working people spontaneously took over at hundreds of other enterprises and establishments.

The mechanism of state-monopoly capitalism was rocked by the mighty popular drive. General Secretary of the FCP, Waldeck Rochet, told the June 1969 Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: "What was characteristic of the movement in May and June 1968, with its nine million strikers was that in addition to advancing its immediate economic demands, it directed a blow against the domination of national life by the monopolies and their state power. It sought deep-going democratic change in the social, economic and political spheres. It showed that the ideas of socialism have been accepted by broad sections of the working people."^{*}

The creative initiative of the masses was expressed in the take-over of the enterprises, in the strike committees' assuming many functions of administration, including control over entry into and exit from cities, issue of credit bonds which some shopkeepers and farmers accepted as money, the arrangement of direct commodity exchange with farmers, and so on. Let us also note the discussions of the question of going on to an "active strike" (that is, resumption of work under self-management and plans drawn up by the working people themselves), and also the dismissal of managers by decision of general meetings of workers. The new forms and methods of struggle were most strongly in evidence at enterprises in Brest, Nantes, Bouguenais, Saclas, Rouen, Sochat, Vitrey, in Paris itself and elsewhere.

The strikers displayed a high capacity for economic management and organisation, ensuring regular supplies of the population throughout the country with the primary necessities (foodstuffs, medicines, and so on), and also uninterrupted supplies of water, gas and electricity.

One of the most important results of the working-class struggle in May and June of 1968 was the adoption by the National Assembly of a new law guaranteeing trade union rights at the enterprises. Every representative trade union

^{*} *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 112.

was given the right so set up its organisations at enterprises employing over 50 blue- and white-collar workers. It received the right to collect membership dues, to post trade union notices, and to circulate handbills on the territory of the plant after working hours. The members of every trade union won the right to hold meetings at the enterprises once a month. Shop stewards are now allowed some time to exercise their functions in working hours and at the expense of the enterprise. At plants employing over 200 workers, trade union organisations have the right to obtain special premises.

In the circumstances, unity was necessary as never before not only at the grass roots, but also among the leadership of the working-class movements and the mass organisations of the Left forces. However, the repeated proposals of the FCP and of the FDCL leadership for a common general democratic programme were rejected by the leaders of the Federation of Left Democrats and Socialists (FLDS), and the reformist trade union centres. This inevitably had an effect on the advance and the results of the working people's class struggle in the spring and summer of 1968.

In the course of the struggle, the revolutionary vanguard was confronted with Right-reformist opportunists and "Left" doctrinaires. During the May and June events, the ultra-"Left", inspired among others by Trotskyite elements in the leadership of the United Socialist Party, tried to discredit the Communist Party's policy, charging that the Communists lacked the "revolutionary spirit", and demagogically claiming that power had "lain in the streets" for anyone to pick up. Rochet declared: "Contrary to the assertions of the proponents of Leftist tendencies, the balance of class forces made it impossible to put on the order of the day the instant establishment of socialist power. On the other hand, it was possible to oust the Gaullist power and set up a regime of advanced democracy opening the path to socialism. What was lacking for putting this very real possibility into practice was unity of the workers and the democratic forces."*

Lack of unity among the Left-wing leadership, the anti-

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 113.

communist intrigues and the real threat of civil war, which was being steadily intensified by the ruling circles, who retained control over the army and the police force, caused the powerful movement to stop half way, without getting at the roots of the social crisis.

At the same time, the French working class won important positions to carry on the fight for deep social and political change. The class battles in France in 1968 were given a high assessment by the world Communist forum in 1969 as an event opening up "new possibilities for the struggle for democracy and socialism".*

Making a thorough study of the many-faceted experience of the working-class struggle, the communist movement gives support to everything valuable produced by massive initiatives. At the same time, the Communists oppose any adulation of spontaneous movements, and seek to organise and co-ordinate them. The Manifesto, "For Advanced Democracy, for a Socialist France!" adopted by the Plenum of the FCP Central Committee on December 6, 1968, says: "Tirelessly organising the struggle of the working people engaged in manual and mental labour, workers and farmers, for their demands and for their freedoms, the French Communist Party will continue its active efforts to unite all workers and democratic forces, whatever their philosophical views, their religious creed, and their party affiliation, in the struggle to break the power of the monopolies."**

There are very serious prerequisites in France for successful united action by the working people. In the post-May period, the working-class movement, far from showing any signs of decline (as many reformist "experts" on social affairs had predicted), has in fact continued to grow in various forms. Not only the socio-economic, but also the political struggle of the working class is being intensified under the leadership of its revolutionary vanguard.***

A fresh wave of large-scale action by the working people swept across the country in 1969, including United Action Day (February 12, 1969) organised by the GCL, and aimed

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 19.

** *L'Humanité*, December 7, 1968.

*** The working people are being induced to carry on the fight as a result of the latest offensive mounted by the monopolies against their gains, including those in the economic sphere.

against the policy of the authorities, specifically against their prices and wages policy; the nation-wide strikes by artisans and small traders (March 5 and April 16, 1969) against excessive taxes; and the nation-wide general strike on March 11, 1969, staged at the call of all the workers' trade union centres and the National Education Federation, which once again paralysed the country's economic life and, together with the 1968 strike, was the biggest action by the French working class in the last decade.

On April 27, 1969, a majority (53 per cent) of the French electorate, voting in a referendum, rejected an anti-democratic bill, which forced President de Gaulle to resign. In the campaign for the presidential election that followed, the Rightist leaders of the SFIO once again started their splitting activity. They rejected a French Communist Party proposal on joint action in support of a common Left candidate, and unilaterally nominated Gaston Defferre, Mayor of Marseilles and a SFIO leader, well-known for his anti-communist and pro-American stance. The division of the Left-wing forces enabled the Rightists to secure the post of President of the Republic for Georges Pompidou, a representative of big capital, who had been prime minister for six years, from 1962 to 1968. In the course of the mounting class battles, the prestige of the proletarian vanguard among the masses of the revolutionary proletariat was ultimately further enhanced, a fact that even the enemies of communism now admit. Thus, the French liberal weekly *L'Express* said in March 1969, that "the main winner of the May days of 1968 . . . is the Communist Party. Today it appears to be powerful and dangerous". The journal noted that it was mainly the Communist Party that was the rallying centre for the country's Left-wing forces.* This is also confirmed by an influx of new members into the leading proletarian organisations. Thus, the GCL, the most important trade union centre in France, increased its membership by 500,000. The growing influence of the Communist Party is evidenced by the successes scored by Communist candidates at the latest mid-term cantonal and municipal elections, and Jacques Duclos's poll of almost 5 million votes—over 21 per cent—in the first round of the presidential elections on June 1, 1969.

* *L'Express*, March 24, 1969, pp. 3-4.

The French proletariat's class battles were a concentrated expression of the acute social problems variously characteristic of many capitalist countries.

The French experience provides much instruction for the present-day working-class movement, and this has been noted by the spokesmen of proletarian organisations in Italy, Belgium, Spain, Japan and other capitalist countries. For instance, it was emphasised at the third conference of Spain's workers' commissions in July 1968, that one of the main lessons the international working-class movement drew from the May strike in France is that many working-class organisations in various countries have been making wider use of the general strike, which they regard as an "extension of a whole series of particular conflicts arising at one enterprise, in one industry, or one populated locality, and then merging and spreading across the country".*

In Italy, the proletariat's class battles and popular movements, which are increasingly anti-monopoly, have assumed vast proportions. A country which had gone through over 20 years of the fascist dictatorship, now sees a vast growth in the influence of the Left forces. In difficult and changing conditions since the war, the Italian Communist Party has invariably been the vanguard of all the progressive forces working for the country's democratic and socialist renewal. It was emphasised at the Twelfth Congress of the ICP in February 1969: "We are fighting for a transfer of all economic and social power into the hands of the workers and farmers, intellectuals, the middle producing sections, organised as a solid national whole, where all the progressive national forces would be represented . . . and all freedoms guaranteed, with the exception of the freedom to exploit others and to speculate on the indigence and health of the poor."**

In the last few years, the Italian working-class movement has taken a big stride forward. The working people's strike struggle was especially vigorous in 1968 and 1969, drawing virtually all the working people of Italy into the vortex of events. In 1968, strikes resulted in a loss of 68 million working hours, and in the first two months of 1969, of 44 million hours.

* *Informaciones y documentación sobre España*, September 11, 1968.

** *L'Unità*, February 9, 1969.

United action by the three main trade union centres, the greater massiveness of action and greater purposefulness and results are qualitatively new factors at the present stage of the Italian proletariat's struggle. In the last few years, strikes involved an average of 85 per cent of the working people in areas affected by the strikes. The very scale of the class battles and the diversity of their forms (strikes, mass picketing, meetings and demonstrations involving many thousands, and so on) are of great importance in further mobilising the working people.

The struggle for a democratic reform of social insurance, and for greater working people's rights at the enterprises has merged with demands for higher pay, abolition of zonal distinctions in pay scales, slowing down the break-neck pace of operations and reducing working hours, full employment, and so on. On November 14, 1968, and February 5, 1969, national strikes were staged by 12 million and 18 million people, respectively, demanding a reform of social insurance. These powerful strikes, which paralysed the country's economic life on both occasions, were accompanied by mass meetings, rallies and manifestations in Italy's major cities and industrial centres.

By securing through stubborn struggle an improvement of the pension system, the working class not only forced an important concession out of monopoly capital and its state, but once again demonstrated its ability to act as spokesman and champion of the vital interests of all working people.

The working class has started to intervene in one of the main spheres of activity of the monopoly bourgeois state, namely, the re-allocation of a sizable part of the national income through the budget. It has been estimated that over the next ten years the state will require 8 billion lire—a vast amount of money—to finance social insurance. The working class and its organisations are now faced with a very serious task: they must see to it that this money does not come from higher taxes on the working people, but from higher taxes on the monopolies, from cutbacks in military spending, and so on.

Another important aspect of the Italian working people's struggle is the drive against zonal distinctions in pay scales, and for guaranteed jobs. In November and December 1968, general strikes were held under these slogans in nine major

regions of Italy and spilled over into dozens of provinces and major cities in the south and in the north. On February 12, 1969, the struggle against zonal pay-scale distinctions, which are hardest on the working people of the south, developed into a nation-wide strike with the participation of 5 million people. Proletarian solidarity and the entry of fresh contingents of the working class into the struggle (on March 12, 1969, at the call of working-class trade union centres, 2 million farm hands and agricultural workers struck across Italy for higher wages, guaranteed employment, pension improvements, and new collective bargaining agreements taking account of the working people's demands for an improvement of their material conditions and extension of trade union rights)—all this forced the monopolies to agree to a phase-out of zonal pay-scale distinctions. It was agreed that by 1972 the minimum rates established in the north, which is in a somewhat better position than the south, are to be adopted over the entire country.

As in other West European countries, the working class in Italy is fighting for the right to hold meetings at the factories and plants, for a statute of the working people's rights, a reform of the placement system, self-administration for the social security agencies and so on. Special importance attaches to the struggle for a radical change in investment policies, which cannot succeed without an extension of the rights of proletarian organisations at every level.

In December 1966, Italian metal workers, after a stubborn 13-month struggle, won new rights in deciding important issues in labour relations at the enterprises. Today, it is not the employers alone that decide on production bonuses, output rates, pace of production, etc. These are handled by special commissions, on which trade unions and management are equally represented.

The strikers also won greater rights for the trade unions at the enterprises. Trade union dues are now officially deducted from workers' wages by the accounting departments directly into the trade union treasury, and this increases the trade unions' fighting possibilities, which has a simultaneous and serious influence not only on the workers, but also on the employers.

In January 1968, workers of Montedison secured the inclusion of their demands in a supplementary collective

agreement, among them a clause establishing a sick-benefits fund, to be controlled by the workers themselves and with the employers contributing; a clause on the employers paying sizable grants to student-workers, who are to be given paid holidays; and a clause on material assistance to workers with children at school or university.

During the bargaining of a national agreement in the summer of 1968, Italian printers got the employers to accept a clause binding them to discuss with the trade unions employment problems, retraining of redundant workers, and so on, resulting from the use of new machinery or new technology.

Of great importance from the standpoint of new working-class demands was the strike struggle at the Fiat works in March and April 1968, when the workers insisted on their right to have a say in fixing working hours. After a stiff struggle, the workers had this right written into their contract.

The Italian proletariat's struggle resulted in a drawn-out crisis of the system of political rule, the rule of the monopolies. At the same time, the democratic movement front was enlarged, as will be seen from the July 1969 events, when joint action by the working people—Communists, Socialists and Catholics—for their common interests toppled the "Centre-Left" coalition, whose aim had been to perpetuate the split in the working class and isolate the Communists. This was also a heavy blow at the Right Socialists, who over the preceding three years had tried to divert the mass movements onto the path of reformist social-democracy. In these conditions, the Italian Communists pointed out, the struggle for unity became a vital task of all the forces working for progress and democracy in Italian society.

The working-class, and with it the general democratic movement, has been developing in highly difficult conditions in areas of the world ruled by dictatorial and avowedly fascist regimes. However, massive terrorism by these regimes failed to smother the fighting spirit of the working class either in Greece, in Portugal or in Spain. In these countries, the dialectics of the struggle against the forces of reaction and oppression has impelled the other contingents of the working people to fight alongside the working class and under its leadership.

Take the heroic example of long-suffering Spain. For 30 years, Franco had boasted that communism in Spain "has been wiped out". For many years, the workers and peasants forced to join the employers in the same trade unions, under total government control, appeared to have no possibility of launching broad action. However, in the early 1960s, the Spanish proletariat openly emerged in the arena of struggle. An appeal by Spanish workers says: "Our movement is a unitary working people's movement uniting all honest men without distinction by creed or ideological conviction. It is a working-class movement, three-quarters of which is made up of us working people, who have no knowledge of civil war, and we feel ourselves to be true patriots precisely because we wish to fulfil our historic internationalist mission for the benefit of all mankind."*

The strikes in Asturias in 1968 showed that there was a great power of protest latent in the Spanish proletariat, which found in the "workers' commissions" a new form for carrying on the anti-Franco struggle. The workers' commissions elected in 1966, now representing almost one million working people, have become an effective instrument for organising the masses.

The workers' commissions, to which the working people delegate their most steadfast fighters, constitute a powerful opposition movement against the Franco dictatorship. They were set up by the masses in the course of the struggle and as a consequence of the struggle. An "Appeal of the Workers' Commissions of Spain to the National Ground, Naval and Air Forces" says: "Our workers' commissions are a specific movement typical of the Spanish working people, a movement which we have developed ourselves, without any promptings from any other country, after the experience of the whole Spanish people and all the years of futile vertical syndicalism convinced us that there was need to break the patterns of the past, because they no longer accorded with the conditions and requirements of the present day."** Today, there are workers' commissions virtually all over the country. Their political influence, authority, capacity to mobilise the masses and their organisational strength make them a most important factor of the present-day situation in Spain. Sup-

* *Mundo obrero*, No. 20, November 1968.

** Ibid.

ported by all the underground parties—Communist, Socialist and Nationalist—and by the trade union alliances and federations, the workers' commissions are giving a lead in the growing protest movement, initiating open political action on a scale unequalled for many years.

In the autumn of 1968, the world watched with admiration the heroic strike by the miners of Asturias, which lasted for several months. The vortex of strikes moved from one area to another. As one pit resumed work, others came to a standstill. On several occasions the strike became general.

The fight against wage ceilings, and for collective agreements framed by the workers themselves, produced a new and militant atmosphere. The country faced the prospect of a great increase in working-class action. Despite the persecutions, the workers' commissions held several national conferences to concert tactics in preparation for a general strike.*

This prospect posed a direct threat for the Franco authorities, who declared a state of siege throughout the country on January 24, 1969. Arrests and harassment of patriots were started to forestall, as the Spanish Minister of Information, Fraga Iribarne, put it, "days similar to those that France experienced in May last year".**

The working class responded to the violence with a powerful tide of strike action.

A statement issued by the Executive Committee of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Spain emphasised that the workers must not retreat in the struggle for new collective agreements, for trade union freedoms and for democracy; they must continue to resort to demonstrations, strikes and wherever possible to a take-over of enterprises. At the same time, the Party pointed to the need to extend and consolidate contacts and ties between the working class and other sections of society.***

Acute social contradictions are also expressed in different forms in the FRG. In 1969, there was once again a marked rise in the strike struggle by various contingents of the working people. FRG trade union leaders admit that "not only four-fifths of the unionised workers, but over one-half of all non-unionised workers consider it right at the present

* *L'Humanité Dimanche*, February 9, 1969.

** *L'Humanité*, January 31, 1969.

*** *Ibid.*, January 30, 1969.

time for the trade unions to resort to strikes to secure their demands".*

The West German proletariat's struggle against the monopoly bourgeoisie is influenced by a number of factors, some of which are specific to the FRG. A definite influence on the advance of the class struggle is undoubtedly exerted by the policies of the Right-wing Social-Democrats, who are still very influential in the West German working-class movement. The Right-wing leaders of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany (SDPG) have been trying hard for many years to contain massive action by the working class, and they are actively helped by the Rightist leaders of the Union of German Trade Unions (UGTU), whose unseemly role was clearly revealed, for instance, in the final phase of the struggle against the "emergency laws". For almost 10 years, the FRG's democratic forces, the working class above all, successfully resisted reactionary attempts to get the laws through the Bundestag. However, they were adopted on May 30, 1968, because at the crucial moment large-scale and united action by the workers was frustrated by the Right-wing leaders of the SDPG and the UGTU. On May 15, an emergency meeting of the central trade union board, under direct pressure from the Social-Democratic ministers, refused to issue a call for a general strike, which was demanded by the workers of many enterprises. Still, hundreds of thousands of blue- and white-collar workers, led by the Communists, took part in strikes, demonstrations and protest rallies.

West German workers are organised in a single trade union federation with 6.5 million members, who, in accordance with long tradition, contribute one per cent of their wages to the trade union fund. This gives the trade unions a large strike fund and enables them to withstand a long strike in case of need. The monopoly bourgeoisie has had to reckon with this fact.

One of the key points of the class struggle in the FRG in the last few years has been the working people's demand for a say in management. Max Reimann, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Germany, stressed: "This demand by the trade unions opened a new period in the class struggle in West Germany."** Here the

* *Welt der Arbeit*, January 24, 1969.

** *Wissen und Tat*, No. 1-2, January-February 1966, p. 15.

example of the GDR, where the working class is full-fledged master of society and the national economy, has had a definite influence.

At the end of 1968, the FRG trade unions, considering the working people's demands, formulated a proposal to establish, with their participation, adequate agencies for inquiry into economic matters.

The West German Communists support the trade union demand that the working people should be given a greater say in management, which is an important component part of the democratic alternative to the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie. The Communists are guided by Lenin's proposition that if the working class in the imperialist countries is to carry on a successful fight against the bourgeoisie it must know its way in every aspect of social activity. Lenin gave a clear-cut formulation of one of the main tasks of the Communist Parties in these countries, when he said: "It is necessary to work for the Party's participation in bourgeois parliaments, in reactionary trade unions and in 'workers' councils' that have been mutilated and castrated in Scheidemann fashion, for the Party to be wherever workers are to be found, wherever it is possible to talk to workers, to influence the working masses."* He attached special importance to the struggle to secure workers' representation at the enterprises, and to give legal form to the rights won by the workers.

All the progressive forces of the West European working-class movement do not view participation in management as a means to create "class peace" and "social partnership" illusions and fight every attempt to turn it into such. That is also the approach of the communist movement in France, Italy, Belgium and other countries. The Communists in the FRG regard the demand for a say in management as a powerful instrument in winning economic positions from the monopoly bourgeoisie and the state step by step. That is why the April 1969 Congress of the German Communist Party put forward a full-scale programme of action in this sphere, providing for freedom of trade union and political activity at the enterprises and in management agencies, defence of the institutions of trade union delegates, members of production councils and young people's representatives;

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 61.

a say in all decisions on working conditions, wages, hours, deductions for social needs at enterprises, holidays, technical improvements and retraining, investment outlays and profits; equal participation in control agencies and boards of large enterprises, economic bodies directing enterprises and state economic agencies; the right and duty of workers' representatives in management bodies to report to their collectives and trade unions on their work.*

The working-class struggle for a say in running the economy has already produced results. For instance, at one of the big enterprises the owners decided to expand production and submitted a decision on capital investment to the supervisory council. The representatives of the workers refused to approve these, because a military contract for the Bundeswehr was involved. At another enterprise, the management recommended the closure of what it believed to be an unprofitable shop, transferring the workers to another sector. This proposal was rejected by the members of the supervisory council representing the workers, because it infringed on the workers' material interests.**

The working-class demand for running the economy is being fiercely resisted by the monopoly bourgeoisie. Fertsch-Röver, Chairman of the West German Association of Independent Industrialists, declared: "We now know that when a demand for co-management is advanced it is not the question of our personal destiny. Should this demand be realised, it would imperil the economic and political system which is the foundation of free enterprise. And we now know that we must fight if we want to survive, that the question confronting German industrialists is 'to be or not to be'."*** This was no mere talk. The monopolies have set up a special fund running to millions of marks to finance propaganda and agitation against this demand. No wonder, even the leadership of the CDU—the chief party of the FRG monopolies—warned all members of its parliamentary group in the Bundestag, among whom there are representatives of the "workers' wing", that anyone supporting this demand would lose his seat in the 1969 elections.****

* *Grundsatzklärung der Deutschen Kommunistischen Partei (DKP). Beschlossen vom Essener Parteitag der DKP 12./13, April 1969, p. 13.*

** See Peter Baumöller, *Mitbestimmen*, Monitor-Verlag, Düsseldorf, O. J., p. 15.

*** *World Marxist Review*, No. 11, 1966, p. 12.

**** *Neues Deutschland*, June 19, 1968.

There is growing awareness in the mass working-class movement that there will be a sharp clash with the monopoly bourgeoisie over this demand. At the last congress in September 1968 of the FRG's biggest Metal Workers' Union (over 2 million members), pressures from below led to the adoption of a resolution binding the trade union board to work out a special programme of action to implement the demand. The resolution emphasises that the struggle to extend workers' participation in running the economy "calls for the highest trade union activity",* that is, resort to the strike weapon.

The problem of workers' co-management was also central at the traditional all-German Twenty-Ninth Workers' Conference held at Leipzig in March 1969. It was held under the slogan "Against the rule of the monopolies—for the participation of West German workers and their trade unions in economic management". It was attended by 1,300 workers and trade union functionaries from the FRG and West Berlin. Addressing the FRG delegates, Werner Heilemann, member of the Presidium and Secretary of the Union of Free German Trade Unions, said: "Of decisive importance has been the fact, above all that we (in the initial period of the transition from capitalism to socialism in the GDR—*Authors*) tied in our struggle for full workers' participation in the management of enterprises with the struggle for power outside the enterprises."**

In several capitalist states, including most of the West European countries, the struggle for the day-to-day demands, in the last few years, has been closely interlaced with the struggle for workers' control. Not only in Italy and France, but also in Britain, Belgium and the Scandinavian countries this slogan put forward by the working people figures in a great many trade union resolutions. Thus, in Belgium, fresh contingents of the working class are joining in the struggle to implement it. Chairman of the Communist Party of Belgium, Marc Drumaux, declared at the Nineteenth Party Congress: "We welcome the workers-activists who are fighting to introduce workers' control in the life of the enterprises."*** A struggle to implement the

* *Nachrichten*, 1968, No. 10, p. 6.

** *Ibid.*, 1969, No. 4, p. 22.

*** *Le Drapeau Rouge*, November 22, 1968, p. 17.

slogan has all possibilities to succeed in Wallonia, where the Left forces are most active. In that region many conditions are present for establishing broad working-class unity in the struggle for employment, and co-management.

The theses approved by the Nineteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Belgium spell out in detail the tasks in the struggle for workers' control at every level. At the enterprise level the task is to "extend the rights of elected representatives of the workers on the councils of the enterprises and also of trade union delegates. To attach to workers' delegates technical advisers appointed by trade union organisations. To give the working people the right to control the use of state subsidies and credits granted to the enterprise. To give the working people the right to assemble at the place of work. To extend the legislation on councils at enterprises to enterprises employing at least 25 persons."*

On the level of the state the task is: "To establish state investment companies (for Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels) with the right of initiative, possessing well-equipped planning bureaus and working with the participation and under the control of the trade unions.

"To ensure truly democratic work by these new organs, trade union representatives on them must be regarded as envoys responsible above all to those who have delegated them, which implies constant ties with trade union members in the form of information, discussion, formulation of general and particular goals, reports on fulfilment of assignments, and so on.

"To extend the right of trade union representatives on the Control Committee for Electricity and Gas, and the Co-ordinating Committee for Ferrous Metallurgy."**

Growing importance attaches to the working people's struggle to extend their rights and to establish workers' control in Britain. For many years, it was expressed mainly in the traditional grass-roots movement of the shop stewards, of whom there are almost 200,000 throughout the country. Many of them skilfully defend the workers' interests, representing them in conflicts with the employers over wages, grading of skills, working conditions, length of working week, and so on.

* *Le Drapeau Rouge*, December 13, 1968, p. 7.

** *Ibid.*, pp. 7-8.

Today, the major trade unions are taking an ever greater part officially in the struggle for workers' control. In 1968, a conference of those favouring workers' control discussed the strategy and tactics of this struggle for the various industries and for the entire trade union movement.

The general theoretical discussion on workers' control has been gradually developing into a practical alternative put forward by the Left wing of the British trade union movement. For instance, the country's second largest union, with over one million members, the Amalgamated Engineering and Foundry Workers' Union, put forward a programme of vigorous offensive to extend the rights of the workers at private enterprises and introduce direct working people's control over all centres administering nationalised enterprises. Characteristically, a special research institute was recently set up in Britain with trade union support to analyse and sum up experience in the movement for workers' control and formulate recommendations for its further development.

The demand to "open the books!"—to allow the working people to scrutinise the accounts—is one of the main ones in the present struggle for workers' control, and it is taking deep root in the British and the West European working-class movement in general. That was precisely the demand in the 1966 strike by British merchant seamen. A government-appointed commission of inquiry headed by Lord Pearson arrived at the conclusion that the shipowners were unable to meet the seamen's demand. The National Union of Seamen declared this decision to be incompetent and argued that the commission did not have all the facts at its disposal, because the shipowners had failed to provide access to all their business records.

The growing working-class opposition to the Labour Government's Prices and Incomes Policy led to its rejection by an overwhelming majority at the TUC Congress in the autumn of 1968. The Labour Party Conference at Brighton, which followed, also demanded a review of this political line. Consequently, the wages freeze was opposed by the Communist Party, the TUC and the Labour Party.

The Prices and Incomes Policy was announced in March 1965, with the official purpose of improving Britain's economic positions and making British products more competitive on external markets. Its principal result was a worsening of the working people's living standards, a curtailment

of trade union possibilities in defending their socio-economic interests, and a stricter state control over labour relations through the establishment of the Prices and Incomes Board with broad powers.

Defining the anti-labour substance of the new policy, member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Great Britain Mick McGahey emphasised: "It is not a temporary policy designed to meet an emergency but a permanent policy designed to appease the capitalists of other countries who are Britain's creditors, and to help the big monopolists to bring the unions more tightly under control. The longer it lasts the more it will undermine the limited freedom won by the past struggles of the workers."^{*}

The growth of class contradictions led to a sharp aggravation in the conflict between the trade unions and the Labour Government, which was alarmed over the mounting discontent of the proletariat, increasingly taking the form of mass strikes, and sought to eliminate, for all practical purposes, the working people's right to strike. For that purpose it tabled a bill in Parliament on criminal punishment for "unofficial" strikes. Acting General Secretary of the TUC Victor Feather declared that for the first time in a century the government was trying to use the criminal code to fight the working class.^{**} Rank-and-file trade unionists and functionaries called for an emergency TUC Congress to discuss the government's anti-trade union policy.

It met on June 5, 1969, attended by representatives of 157 trade unions with 8,750,000 members. Three resolutions were adopted: one reaffirming that the trade union movement resolutely objected to the government's proposal to apply financial sanctions against wildcat strikes; a second approving the proposal of the TUC General Council, in its Programme for Action, providing for the transfer to the TUC of the right to deal with the strikes itself; and a third approving some of the government's proposals to amend existing trade union legislation.

Let us emphasise that the Programme for Action bears the marks of an obvious compromise with the government, because while rejecting legal action against those who stage

^{*} Mick McGahey, *The Case for Higher Wages*, Communist Party Pamphlet, London, 1968, p. 17.

^{**} *Pravda*, April 14, 1969.

and take part in wildcat strikes, it insists on the need to combat these strikes.

That is why, a number of large trade unions (electricians, draughtsmen, and so on), with more than one million members, announced their disagreement with the policy of concessions to the government and their intention to fight in defence of the right to stage unofficial strikes, which the working class had won in long years of struggle.

The Communist Party of Great Britain supports trade union members seeking to establish workers' control. Its programme, *The British Road to Socialism*, adopted at its Thirtieth Congress in 1967, says: "This right of the workers to be involved in policy-making and control in industry is essential for economic advance and to safeguard the interests of the working people."* The Communist Party regards this as a possible basis for rallying all the Left-wing forces of the British labour movement in the fight against monopoly domination.

In the Scandinavian countries, the working class and its organisations have also been extending their struggle for their rights at the enterprises. In Denmark, for instance, the workers and their trade unions seek to have production councils set up at every enterprise with the right to obtain full information about the operation and financial state of the enterprise and to control its activity. Production councils are demanding the right to participate in working out and adopting decisions on plans to reorganise and expand production, on investment policy, and on the hiring, dismissal and transfer of workers. In its Programme Declaration of 1969, the Communist Party of Denmark demanded that representatives of trade unions, consumer societies and wage workers' organisations, working people engaged in farming and fishing, and representatives of other mass organisations should be represented on the public agencies directing economic development. It insists that the number of these representatives should be adequate to exercise decisive democratic control over the activity of these agencies.**

The drive for workers' control was an important problem at the Eleventh Working Conference of Working People's

* *The British Road to Socialism. Programme of the Communist Party.* Published by the Communist Party, London, 1968, p. 33.

** *Land og folk*, February 22, 1969.

Representatives from the Baltic Countries, which was held in July 1968. It was attended by representatives of the trade unions affiliated with the World Federation of Trade Unions and the International Confederation of Free Trade Unions. Its resolution said, in part: "The greater the influence the trade unions exercise on the course of the scientific and technological revolution by participating in economic management, the greater the opportunities for controlling the use and distribution of the fruits of technical progress. This is an essential prerequisite for ensuring peace and the welfare and happiness of all people."*

The conclusion drawn by the revolutionary proletarian movement that the struggle to extend working-class rights and influence on the direction of state affairs is a component part of the struggle against the system of capitalist exploitation has been fully borne out by life.

In the last few years, Japan has been the scene of acute social conflicts and large-scale class action by the proletariat.

Labour Conflicts in Japan (1963-1967)

	Various Forms of Conflicts	
	Number	Numbers involved (1,000)
1963	2,016	9,035
1964	2,422	7,971
1965	3,051	8,975
1966	3,087	10,947
1967	4,844	19,624

Source: *Rodo nomln undo*, No. 7, 1968, p. 1.

The incomplete official statistics, which tend to conceal the true proportions of the class struggle waged by the proletariat and its allies in this instance ignore the so-called spring and autumn offensives which have become an important and traditional drive unmatched by anything similar in the world.

Every spring and autumn since 1965, the Japanese proletariat has staged, under the direction of the trade unions,

* *Nachrichten*, No. 8, 1968, p. 13.

mass manifestations against capital, involving from 7 to 14 million persons. The strike struggle, going hand in hand with massive demonstrations, rallies and protest marches, is staged by the trade unions under common slogans and a common plan. And the occasion is taken to put forward economic and political demands.

By 1968, this country, with a population of 100 million, and a rapidly growing working class, had forged into second place in the capitalist world in gross output at the cost of intense effort. Meanwhile it ranks 21st in income per head of population. The millions of strikers are demanding that this gap should be bridged, and want "average European" pay scales, guaranteed minimum living wages, stable prices, lower taxes, adequate housing, and so on.

The Japanese working people's offensive, which in 1968 was unprecedented in scale, resulted in a 14 per cent average wage rise. The 1969 spring offensive, in which over 10 million took part, resulted in another wage rise of 16 per cent. This was a most convincing demonstration of the power and effect of united action by the working class.

The tension on the social front has gone hand in hand with more vigorous and massive political action. In 1968, the working class mounted a campaign against the renewal in 1970 of the Japanese-American "security" treaty. The struggle against Japan's support of American aggression in Vietnam is also becoming more acute. On October 21, 1968, the third Day of United Action in support of the Vietnamese people was held in 363 cities, involving 4.5 million persons. The country was swept by a tide of demonstrations, rallies and mass manifestations in protest against the criminal US policy. Strikes were staged by the dockers of Yokohama, who refused to handle US transports carrying arms and equipment. Railway junctures handling freight for US military bases were idle.

A characteristic feature of the Japanese working-class movement, which is gaining in scope and prominence in the international working-class movement, is the ever closer integration of socio-economic and political demands.

In 1968-69, Australia was rocked by powerful and massive action. Millions of industrial workers downed tools in protest against savage anti-trade union legislation which has now been in operation for 20 years. One half of the country's industrial workers participated in the political

struggle. The working people's action was unequalled in scope for the last 80 years.

The United States, the leading imperialist country, has become an arena of large-scale and intense class battles.

Gus Hall, General Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA, told the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969 that "the most dynamic and potent expression of the new wave of struggle and the process of radicalisation in the United States is the rapid growth of organised rank-and-file movements in the shops and trade unions".*

This conclusion has been confirmed by the growth of working-class strikes in the USA. In 1966, strikes involved 1,960,000 working people and a loss of 25,400,000 man-days. In 1967, the figures were respectively 2,870,000 and 40,500,000. In 1968, the figures were even higher. There were almost 5,000 strikes of unprecedented persistence and duration. For instance, a strike by 60,000 workers in the copper-smelting industry lasted for eight and a half months. In the course of the struggle, 26 trade union organisations pooled their efforts and ultimately obtained satisfaction of their demands.

Early 1969 saw a tenacious and well-knit struggle by longshoremen on the East coast of the United States against the shipping companies. At the same time, a struggle for their rights was started by the steel workers of Pittsburg, the railroad men of Florida, the miners of Michigan, and other contingents of the working people.

This invigorated working-class struggle led to changes in the ranks of the US trade union movement, with some unions taking a more active part in political action in view of the growing protest across the country against the continuing war in Vietnam, and also the Negro civil rights movement and the fight against anti-labour laws.

There is good reason why the conservative leadership of the AFL-CIO, led by George Meany, has been coming up against growing opposition in the unions and is being increasingly isolated in the international arena. The withdrawal in 1968 from the AFL-CIO of the United Automobile Workers, one of the largest in the country (over 1.2 million members), the resolute condemnation by the UAW

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 430.

and other unions of the aggression in Vietnam, the growing co-ordination of action by the automobile workers and a number of other major unions, and the recent establishment of the Alliance for Labour Action have, for all practical purposes, led to the establishment of another national trade union centre, objectively a serious challenge to the dictatorship of Rightist bosses like Meany.

Under the current scientific and technological revolution, the working class and its organisations have been trying to adopt the best methods of organising class battles, including strikes. Thus, the trade union movement has taken account of the fact that stoppages on various sectors staged in accordance with a special schedule will bring to a halt many enterprises. Alternating strikes, instant strikes, strikes started at the worst possible moment for the employers, and so on, all indicate that the working people, whether working by hand or by brain, are taking a rational and considered attitude to strikes as a weapon that one must know how to use effectively.

This approach to the organisation of strikes has long been making headway. When short stoppages were staged at the Thomson-Houston company, France's major electronics enterprise, they held production in a feverish state for three days, with the result that the plant was paralysed for six weeks, with the strikers suffering almost no loss in wages. What is more, as a result of the strike the employers were forced to increase wages by 6-8 per cent.

The strike, a proletarian weapon, is also being adopted as a form of protest by white-collar workers, including scientists. In March 1969, scientists at more than 30 universities and research centres in the USA held their first nation-wide strike in the country's history. They were protesting against the government's use of scientific and technological achievements for military purposes.

Young newcomers to the ranks of the proletariat have exercised a marked influence on the tenor of social conflicts in recent years. Working-class youth, Waldeck Rochet said in early 1969, "took the main part in the great strike movement in May and June 1968, and were in the forefront of the fight for their demands, for social progress and against capitalism and gaullism."* Young people were also in the

* *L'Humanité*, February 25, 1969.

front ranks of the large-scale strike battles which rocked Italy throughout 1968, in the militant action by the British proletariat against the Labour Government and the labour bills, and in the strikes which forced the Franco regime to lift the state of emergency in Spain well ahead of the set deadline.

The young workers have displayed high militancy, boldness and inventiveness. Characteristically they have again and again put forward the most important and far-reaching demands. The young workers have insistently demanded working-class unity and a break-up of the political and ideological partitions artificially dividing the working people's forces. It is not surprising, apparently, that the most marked advance towards united action by various contingents of the massive working-class movement is now evident in countries where the working class has been most markedly rejuvenated, notably, Spain (60 per cent of the workers are between 20 and 24 years), Italy (over 50 per cent of the workers under 30 years), France (over 30 per cent under 25 years), and in Japan (over 60 per cent under 30 years). With characteristic impetuosity, the young people want trade union unity established at once.

Consequently, the facts confirm that the development of present-day state-monopoly capitalism has served further to deepen the antagonism between labour and capital, an antagonism which is being intensified by the scientific and technological revolution, which sharpens the main contradictions of bourgeois society and produces fresh contradictions which are highly dangerous for imperialism. In view of all these factors, the international communist movement has reached the conclusion that, "The present period is characterised by a sharpening of the struggle of the working class and of the broad masses of working people not only for an improvement of their economic conditions but also for political demands. While defending their vital interests, the working people fight for social rights and democratic freedoms. These demands are increasingly directed against the system of domination by monopoly capital, against its political power. . . . The big battles of the working class in a number of capitalist countries are undermining the power of the monopolies, intensifying the instability and contradictions of capitalist society. These struggles foreshadow new class battles which could lead to funda-

mental social change, socialist revolution, and the establishment of the power of the working class in alliance with other segments of the working people.”*

THE WORKING CLASS
AND THE GENERAL DEMOCRATIC MOVEMENTS
UNDER PRESENT-DAY STATE-MONOPOLY
CAPITALISM

The general social tension in the world capitalist system is especially heightened as the *proletarian* struggle increasingly interacts and intertwines with the *general democratic* movements, which have been sharply stepped up in the last few years.

It is the development of imperialism itself that leads to an extension of the social framework of the general democratic movements. State-monopoly capitalism, with its inherent tendency to subordinate every aspect of life in society to the dictates of monopoly capital, creates the medium for democratic, anti-monopoly protest in ever wider spheres of social life. Fresh social groups and sections come in to enlarge the front of democratic struggle. Today, the columns of demonstrators carrying democratic slogans include the leading workers, who are convinced fighters against the power of the monopolies, and side by side with them men and women who until the other day had been reconciled to the existing order. For many non-proletarian sections and groups participation in the democratic movement is a first step towards realising the fundamental contradictions between their interests and the policy of the monopoly ruling circles.

This process is historically inevitable but is not automatic. The formation of anti-monopoly blocs and coalitions largely depends on the capacity of the working class, and its political and trade union organisations to realise the proletariat's uniting and leading role in practice. Behind the motley composition, the loose organisation, the ideological vagueness and other features normally characterising such movements, the Communists have not failed to see the

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 24.

fundamental fact that they express the people's vital demands.

This applies above all to such a major stream in the present-day democratic movement as the *peace movement*, which substantially differs from pacifist campaigns in the early years of this century, or the struggle for peace on the eve of the Second World War. It emerged in the late 1940s and early 1950s, and first made its voice heard in the famous Stockholm Appeal, which proposed that any government which first resorted to the use of atomic weapons should be branded as a war criminal. Although the Appeal was signed by 500 million persons, sizable sections of the population in the capitalist countries remained outside the active struggle for peace. Today, the peace movement is much more massive, and includes numerous groups of intellectuals, students, and petty and middle bourgeoisie. The International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969 declared that *"the main link of united action of the anti-imperialist forces remains the struggle against war for world peace, against the menace of a thermonuclear world war and mass extermination which continues to hang over mankind"*.*

The universities and associations of scientific workers are ever more actively joining in the struggle for peace in the USA, the citadel of world imperialism. Thousands of American scientists signed demands on the US Administration for an end to the war in Vietnam and a halt to the arms race. Anti-war manifestations by American students have become nation-wide, involving almost 2.5 million persons. The students mounted boycotts against the agents of the Pentagon and corporations engaged in manufacturing napalm and other means of annihilation. Many student groups are engaged in active propaganda against participation in the Vietnam war and service in the army, and have set up a network for helping young American draft dodgers who seek refuge in other countries, and so on.

In France, massive action against the war in Vietnam has assumed vast proportions. Only from 1967 to 1969, the country was the scene of tremendously successful campaigns under such slogans as "Ships for Vietnam" (collection and

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 31.

dispatch of drugs, and material assistance to the Vietnam patriots), "A Million for Vietnam" (collection of funds in aid of the Vietnamese people) and other solidarity manifestations. These were mounted on the initiative of the Communist Party and other progressive organisations, and actively involved the broadest sections of the working people.

In recent years, Italy has been the scene of a massive fund-raising campaign to pay for medical equipment for Vietnam. Together with the Communists and other working-class organisations, it included numerous leaders and groups speaking for the intelligentsia, the middle urban and rural sections, who took part in mammoth demonstrations and meetings against the Vietnam war (the "peace vigil" in Rome, demonstrations in Milan, Livorno, Naples, and so on). It is a remarkable fact that groups and sections under the control of the Catholic Church have been ever more actively joining in the anti-war movement. There was wide response across the country to the action by Perugia Catholics, who held an exhibition of documents in their cathedral exposing the atrocities of the US aggressors in Vietnam. Many Catholics joined with a Catholic philosopher, Aldo Capitini, who organised "peace marches" across several regions in Italy.

There has been a vast growth of the anti-war movement in Britain, whose origins go back to the limited initiatives of those who organised the Aldermaston March. British ruling circles were seriously alarmed over the 50,000-strong protest demonstration against the war in Vietnam, held in London in the autumn of 1968. As in other Western countries, white-collar workers, students, intellectuals and middle urban sections are broadly represented in the peace movement in Britain. The social base of the peace movement has also been extended in the Scandinavian countries. As more and more non-proletarians join in the struggle for peace, the anti-war movement acquires increasingly diverse forms.

In many states of Western Europe and the Americas, there are traditional "Easter Marches" for peace and "Peace Marches", in which more and more people have been taking part from year to year. Thus, in 1968, 300,000 took part in such marches in the FRG. Only in the first few days of April 1969, "Peace Marches" were staged in 40

cities across the USA. There was broad international response to the activities of the "Spies for Peace" in Britain, who published top secret maps showing nuclear base sites in the country. Participants in the anti-war movement in the USA organised the widely reported manifestations against the dispatch of US troops to Vietnam. The military base at Oakland, the main embarkation point, was fully blockaded as the result of a "siege" from land and sea; peace fighters took over the base and held it for several hours. Another widely reported action was the "siege" of the Pentagon in 1968 by thousands of demonstrating peace fighters.

Among the everyday practices of the mass anti-war movements are such forms of struggle as sit-ins by peace fighters, who block and disorganise urban traffic, thereby drawing public attention, collective public hunger strikes, the picketing and blockade of induction stations (USA), US missions and military bases (Western Europe, Japan, etc.), and so on. On many occasions, resort to more violent forms of struggle has led to fierce clashes with the police. Frequently, the mass arrests and other repressive measures taken by the authorities are regarded by the anti-war fighters themselves as a necessary stage in the struggle, and an effective means of rousing public awareness.

Let us note that non-proletarian sections of the working people—peasants, traders, students and intellectuals—have been making ever wider use of proletarian forms of struggle (strikes, picketing, and so on). Thus, 800 students of the University of California (USA) arrested for taking part in strikes and demonstrations to prevent the dispatch of US troops to Vietnam came almost entirely from well-to-do bourgeois or bourgeois-intellectual families.

The general radicalisation of the struggle for peace with the active participation of the Communists is an important prerequisite for the anti-war movements moving closer to the vanguard of the working class. As a result, anti-war slogans are filled with much clearer content. This will be seen from the growth of "anti-Americanism" everywhere in connection with the struggle to stop the war in Vietnam, and against the enslaving agreements with the USA in Italy, Norway and Canada. Evidence of this also comes from the movement of the Japanese working people calling for a cancellation of the Japanese-American "Security

Pact", which is regarded as a most important condition for the progressive and democratic forces scoring a victory over the Liberal Democrats, the party ruling on a mandate from the giant monopolies. Thus, the anti-war movement is merging with the general anti-monopoly struggle.

Assessing the prospects in the struggle for peace today, the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in 1969 said in its Appeal in Defence of Peace that "lasting peace is no longer a utopia—it is a fully feasible aim. Mighty social and political forces exist in the world today which oppose war and work for a relaxation of tension and broad international co-operation".*

The anti-war movement is closely linked with the *anti-fascist movement*, another major democratic mass trend in our day, which has become an "essential part of the action against imperialism, for democratic freedoms".**

There is virtually no developed capitalist country without direct or indirect experience of fascism or a knowledge of the fatal consequences it has had for mankind. That is why there is a vigorous response among the broadest sections of society to any attempts to revive fascism. The forces giving a rebuff to the neo-fascists, as in the hot July days of 1960 in Italy (when the Tambroni Government tried to fall back on Mussolini's followers to deal a crushing blow at the democratic movement), are headed by the working class, the Communists and the class-conscious trade unions. In Britain, there is a fine tradition of giving a rebuff to any action by the thugs from local fascist groups: any attempt on their part to stage a public meeting has always been crushed by the democratic forces. Even in the Federal Republic of Germany, where the government's repressive policy over many years was designed to create a "vacuum on the Left", the neo-nazi party is coming up against growing resistance from the democratic forces. Thus, at the end of February 1969, 5,000 people demonstrated at Schwabach against the staging of a local congress by the neo-nazi party.

The anti-fascist movement today is very broad in social make-up: together with the workers, who constitute its backbone, it includes many intellectuals, especially students;

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 48.

** *Ibid.*, p. 35.

moreover, its slogans are being ever more widely adopted by social groups and sections which earlier offered support and sustenance to fascism: the middle urban and rural sections and even some members of the army and the police. This extension of the range of those taking part in the anti-fascist movement is due to the fact, in particular, that today fascist regimes may be established in a different way than in the past. There is a possibility of fascist coups from "above", by agencies of international, primarily US, imperialism (NATO), with support from local top leaders of the army and the gendarmerie, and small groups of conspirators ensconced in agencies of the capitalist states which are immune to democratic control (intelligence and counter-intelligence, all manner of "security services", and so on). This will be seen from the unsuccessful attempt to stage a fascist coup in Italy in 1964, the 1967 coup in Greece, and some of the secret NATO plans which were leaked to the press. This type of fascist coup runs in line with the basic tendency of state-monopoly capitalism, which is utmost concentration of power in the hands of the financial-industrial oligarchy, the whittling down of real rights and functions of representative institutions, and establishment of domination by international monopolies over once-sovereign states.

In these conditions, anti-fascist action is being increasingly staged under slogans calling for democratisation of the whole social structure, as in the campaign to bring out all the facts and participants in the "SIFAR Affair" in Italy, mounted by the Communist Party and other Left-wing forces. Under massive pressure, the government was forced to give way and to agree, even if with some reservations, to a parliamentary inquiry into the SIFAR Affair.

It is highly indicative that the anti-fascist movement in the FRG, which is campaigning against the existence of the neo-nazi party, and for a repeal of the "emergency laws" and other anti-constitutional acts, has put forward as one of its main slogans a demand to "Expropriate Springer", the mammoth publishing concern which is one of the main tools of the political domination of the monopolies in the FRG*; it is closely allied with the state and is one of the main instru-

* The Springer concern controls 40 per cent of the dailies in the FRG (including *Bildzeitung*, which has the biggest circulation) and 70 per cent of the dailies in West Berlin.

ments for implanting neo-fascist ideology and organising the neo-nazi forces. The demand that it should be socialised and democratically controlled is therefore aimed at one of the pillars of the state-monopoly system in the FRG.

On the whole, the anti-monopoly trend in the anti-fascist movement creates new conditions for joint struggle by the working class and other sections of the people.

The movement of the toiling peasantry and the middle sections in town and country has an important part to play in extending and strengthening the democratic movements, and enlarging the front of the anti-monopoly struggle. In the last few years, capitalist society has been repeatedly shaken by powerful action staged by these groups of the population, among them protest demonstrations by French smallholders which verged on uprising; strikes and manifestations by Italian farmhands, sharecroppers and farmers; poverty-ridden Spanish peasants, and protests by small farmers in the FRG. This action testifies to the marked changes in the content and direction of the struggle by the rural masses, changes which extend the basis for an alliance between the peasantry and the working class and the other forces of the anti-monopoly struggle.

The principal demand of the traditional peasant movement used to be the demand for land and security for their holdings against the encroachments of the big landowners. The "Land to those who till it!" slogan is still meaningful today for millions of labouring peasants (especially in countries like Spain). However, broad masses of peasants are coming to realise that this slogan is quite inadequate, as the monopolies, bypassing the landowning middleman, intrude in agricultural production and have their interests met through state-monopoly "regulation".

The rapid reduction in the number of farmers, as the small landowners are ruined and leave the land, is typical of many developed capitalist countries. In the USA, over 110,000 farmers are ruined every year. From 1945 to 1966, their number dropped from 6,000,000 to 3,968,000. Since 1950, 563,000 farms were wound up in the FRG, and the number of those employed in farming fell by over 2,000,000. Only in 1968, 24,000 farmers were ruined in the FRG. In Italy, over the last 30 odd years, the share of the population engaged in agriculture fell from 49 per cent to 24 per cent. In France, over 50,000 farms are ruined every year,

and 160,000 former farmers go to the cities in search of jobs. At the turn of the century, France's agricultural population came to 45 per cent of the total, but today it is slightly over 15 per cent. The eight per cent of the population engaged in Sweden's agriculture and fisheries is expected to go down to five per cent over the decade ahead. Even in Spain, where the peasantry recently constituted an absolute majority of the working population, its share has sharply declined over the last 10 years and now comes to only one-third of the working population.

At the basis of this process is the rapid intensification of agriculture and its growing productivity through the use of the latest machines, fertilisers, pesticides and other means supplied to the peasants at monopoly-high prices. The peasants' debt has been growing with every year.

The only way out of this situation for the farmers is to pool the efforts of the small farms to enable them to put up some sort of stand for their interests in the fight against the highly productive large capitalist farms and against the wholesalers who have been steadily pressing down their purchase prices. However, this entails, in the first place, creation of conditions for establishing and developing co-operatives; the possibility of obtaining loans and credits, scientific and technical assistance; easy terms for leasing premises and transporting produce, and so on. In this way, the old demand for land is being extended and supplemented in the slogans of the peasant movement by demands for the public support of associated farms, and demands for a change in the *government's agrarian policy*. Those were chiefly the demands put forward during the peasants' "disorders" in Bretagne, France, in the early 1960s, when the desperate farmers blocked roads with their tractors, stormed town-halls and prefectures, and fought pitched battles with the police. Similar demands repeatedly rouse to struggle the peasants in the south of Italy, including hundreds of thousands of small farmers who received allotments under the agrarian reform only 5 or 10 years ago, but who have already gone to the wall.

The oppression of the peasants has been sharply intensified with the entry into force of the Common Market's agricultural agreements. Great masses of rural producers found themselves defenceless in face of ruthless competition from large specialised capitalist farms from other countries.

To the specific peasant demands were added the demands for a change of the entire economic and external economic national line.

A mammoth, 100,000-strong demonstration of peasants, sharecroppers and small tenant farmers, who had come from every part of the country, was staged in the Italian capital in the summer of 1968, with slogans like "Stop the operation of the Rome Treaty!" and "A new agrarian Government policy!". In the first few months of 1969, tens of thousands of peasants in the FRG—10,000 farmers demonstrating in Schleswig-Holstein, over 50,000 in Hessen, 5,000 in Upper Franconia, and so on—protested against the consequences of the Common Market for the national agriculture.

The question of allies becomes an especially acute one for the peasantry when the small rural producer finds himself face to face not with the individual owner of the landed estate, but with a gigantic (frequently international) monopoly, a state of monopolies, and even a supranational association of inter-state monopolies (the Common Market). The first and most natural ally is the working class, the only real force which can rally all the victims of the ruthless monopoly drive.

In the last few years, this has served as a basis for the emergence and development of new phenomena like joint action by workers and peasants. For instance, in 1966, French peasants gave active support to workers' strike in Le Havre and Bordeaux. The long strike of sugar-beet growers and workers of sugar refineries in several areas of Italy was an example of joint struggle for a common goal—nationalisation of Eridania, the Italian sugar monopoly.

For its part, the peasantry constantly feels the powerful support of the organised proletariat and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard. For instance, French peasants had visual proof of the positive outcome of the May 1968 strike: in face of the working people's massive offensive, the government was forced, in order to "neutralise" the peasants, to carry out a series of measures easing social tensions in the countryside. Action by Italian peasants is invariably supported by the working class: the Communists and other Left-wing parties have been campaigning in the press, in parliament and in the municipalities for satisfaction of the legitimate demands of the labouring sections in the countryside. In fact, it is to the

Communists and the working class that the Italian peasantry primarily owes both the post-war agrarian reform and the many other progressive changes in agriculture. The struggle of the Left-wing forces, led by the Communist Party, for a general economic and cultural development of Italy's backward south, for elimination of feudal survivals (such as the rule of the Mafia in Sicily), for disarmament of the police (following the fusillade of demonstrating farmhands in the province of Syracuse) and so on, that is, for purposes directly meeting the most fundamental interests of rural toilers, has driven home to the peasants the need for an alliance with the working class. At their 12th Congress in February 1969, the Italian Communists resolutely confirmed that a working-class alliance with the peasantry continued to be one of the main conditions for the struggle to transform society.

This alliance acquires especial importance in Spain, where the economic oppression of the peasantry, together with its spiritual enslavement by the Catholic Church, is one of the conditions for the continuing Franco dictatorship. That is why the Communist Party of Spain and the "workers' commissions"—these most representative and massive organisations of the working class—have spared no effort in working among the peasants. The Communists' assistance to the Spanish peasantry is evident not only in their expressions of solidarity with peasant action, like the mass disobedience campaign in Lérida Province in 1966, but especially in carrying political enlightenment to the peasants, and sharing experience in the struggle and organisation of the urban proletariat. It is hard to exaggerate the importance for the future of Spain of such a fact as the emergence in recent years of the ever more numerous "peasant commissions".

Addressing the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, L. I. Brezhnev said: "Work in the midst of the peasant masses of the capitalist states continues to be of great importance. The working peasants remain the chief allies of the working class, despite the fact that their number has declined considerably in the advanced capitalist countries."*

There is a similar evolution to that of the peasantry today among the middle urban sections (the masses of artisans, owners of semi-handicraft enterprises, small traders, and

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 150.

so on). Their enslavement by the monopolies is now patent: whether through their dependence on orders or marketing outlets through wholesale channels, or through direct dependence on the subsidiaries of large concerns (owners of petrol stations, technical service stations, all types of franchisers, and so on). The middle sections suffer fiercely from the government policy, pursued exclusively in the interests of the big monopolies, on taxes, credits, urban development, customs tariffs, and so on. That is the cause of the ever more bitter discontent in these sections which has made the small and even a part of the middle urban bourgeoisie more frequently side with the anti-monopoly democratic forces.

In March and April 1969, responding to a call from the General Confederation of Small and Middle Enterprises in France, artisans and small traders staged national action days in defence of their social rights, closing down many shops, hotels, cafés, restaurants, hairdressers and even pharmacies. Signs were put up in their show-windows declaring that they were closed in protest against excessive taxes which stifle trade and cause the price spiral. Ten thousand small traders and artisans marched through the streets of Lorient in France. A protest meeting at Bordeaux was attended by 7,000. Most of the shops in Lyons were closed. All the shops were closed in La Rochelle. Petrol station owners and tobacconists were on strike at Calais and Dunkirk.

In April 1969, the middle urban sections in France once again used the proletarian weapon—the strike—with almost one million taking part, to draw public attention to their problems and get the government to meet their demands. Because these were legitimate and objectively aimed against the monopolies, the French working class came out in their support and for a democratic reform of the tax system, an improvement of social insurance, an extension of credits and development of co-operatives.

The struggle (and interaction with other forces of the anti-monopoly movement) by the middle sections in Italy presents a somewhat different picture. Among the new forms of struggle developed there in the last few years is the “city strike”, which is a general strike involving industrial workers, personnel in the service industries, school teachers and pupils, small traders, artisans, and so on. Such strikes, staged at Milan, Genoa, Trieste and Livorno, visually bring together and direct into a single channel the

diverse motives behind the protest against the state-monopoly power: the growing cost of housing and the decline in real wages, chaotic urban transit, and the policy which dooms large economic areas to stagnation, the speculation in real estate, and the gearing of whole industries to the interests of a single monopoly, etc. The leading role in staging such action belongs to the trade unions, the Communist Party, and the other Left-wing forces of Italy.

This entry into the anti-monopoly struggle and ever more active participation in it of the peasantry and the middle urban sections fully bears out Lenin's analysis of the development of the socialist revolution in Europe as a constant aggravation of the antagonism between the imperialist monopolies and those who seek to put an end to their arbitrary rule.

An important component of the general democratic movement in the capitalist countries is the struggle for equality of the oppressed nationalities and national minorities, such as the *Negro civil rights movement in the USA*. This movement, both in its importance in American life and its international repercussions, goes well beyond the framework of a "purely Negro" problem.

In the liberatory, democratic movement of the 20-million Negro population in the USA, social and national elements are inextricably fused. Not long ago, in the 1950s, the traditional Negro organisations used to concentrate on the struggle to secure civil rights, obtain access for Negroes to places of public resort, and do away with the most humiliating aspects of racial discrimination. Their main method was "non-violent" action designed mainly to produce a moral and psychological effect.

In the mid-1960s, there came a turning point in the massive Negro movement. Negro riots and uprisings broke out in the ghettos of Los Angeles, Detroit, New York, Chicago and dozens of other American cities. Earlier, the movement was ruled mainly by the Negro bourgeoisie and the intelligentsia, but then the Negro poor—the slum dwellers, the unemployed, the youth and the workers—took over. Having overcome the moderate, "non-violent" stance of the old Negro leaders, these deprived sections infused in the movement a sharp militant spirit and a new orientation, aiming it against the social, class pillars of racism.

For the Negro masses, the problems which are common

for every section of the US working class appear in concentrated and highly acute form, although the Negro poor do not always find it easy to understand these problems (even if only because of their inadequate education).

Accent on socio-economic demands testifies to the growing proportion of workers in the Negro movement and the erosion of liberal illusions among the non-proletarian groups of the Negro population. National Secretary of the Communist Party of the USA, Claude Lightfoot said: "The most outstanding event of 1968 is that the working-class contingents have become a key force of the movement. Almost every class segment of the Negro population is becoming aware of the need to change the workers' living conditions as one of the main levers for advance along the way of progress."*

Equally important is the fact that the political and ideological aspects of the Negro movement have become more pronounced. The struggle for equal Negro participation in political life is a struggle for a more democratic South and a change in the balance of political forces in the country. The heightened political activity of the Negro masses is already being tangibly felt on a national scale. Thus, in the 1964 Presidential elections the Negroes helped to defeat Goldwater. In the recent period, they have helped to vote in 378 leaders of their movement to local government offices (including 107 persons in 1968 alone). Three million Negroes—a million more than a few years ago—secured registration as voters in the Southern states.

At the same time, the Negro masses are joining ever more vigorously in anti-war action: the programmes of the major Negro organisations include demands for an end to the war in Vietnam, a return of the US troops home, and the use of military appropriations to solve America's most acute social problems. In this way, the Negro movement, rising above its own limited aims, and issuing a challenge to the power of the monopolies and their state, is becoming one of the main allies of the proletarian vanguard in the USA.

* * *

An analysis of the main tendencies in the democratic movement shows that some interrelated processes have been developing in its midst. The movement is extending its so-

* *Pravda*, February 20, 1969.

cial base, and socio-economic and socio-political slogans are more numerous; the entry of fresh non-proletarian sections is accompanied with more radical forms and methods of struggle. Starting from highly different social, political, ideological, and philosophical points, the participants in the democratic movements are gradually coming to realise the objective need to establish close ties and an alliance with the working class, and its political and trade union organisations. The evolution of the goals and forms of the general democratic movement, while providing practical day-to-day confirmation of the Marxist-Leninist conclusion that the struggles for democracy and for socialism are indissoluble, leads the groups and sections involved to a clash with the capitalist system itself, and consequently, to a search for the most dependable and consistent allies in the struggle.

As the front of the anti-monopoly struggle is enlarged, the working-class movement is faced with many complex problems. The need to unite and orient diverse social forces, which have been gradually shedding the influence of the bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties, daily presents a test to the capacity of the proletariat's class parties to give timely definition to the intermediate goals and slogans in the struggle, keeping them commensurate in volume and depth with the pace of the movement and bringing out in the living reality the forms and lines of action which meet the common interests of the proletarian struggle. These tasks were especially acute before the working-class movement when the massive democratic movement exploded and involved the broadest sections of the young people, the students, above all.

It is hard to over-rate the socio-political importance of the students' protest, considering that not very long ago the bulk of the students was a passive, apolitical mass, or even a reserve of reaction. Clark Kerr, head of the University of California at Berkeley, smugly declared in 1959 that the employers would like the young generation, they would have nothing to complain about and could easily manage them. He promised that there would be no more riots.* In 1957, replying to a question from the French Institute of Public Opinion, "Will your generation differ from the generation of your fathers?", 76 per cent of the students said

* *Critica marxista*, No. 6, 1968, p. 217.

"No". In a similar poll in 1968, 92 per cent of those polled replied "Yes".* Men of the older generation, says Giorgio Casalino, a leader of an Italian Communist Party federation in the South, "are frequently surprised when they recall that only a few years ago ... the only student demonstrations in our area were manifestations under nationalistic, reactionary and anti-communist slogans. Today we feel the freshness and purity of the students' squall even if we are not yet able to say that most of the participants in the movement are Marxists. This is a strong, sincere and democratic outburst."**

The sharp change in the mood of student youth observed over the last few years has many causes: socio-political (above all reflecting the increasing general socio-political instability of imperialism, the further aggravation of the crisis of its aggressive foreign policy, and a deepening of its internal class antagonisms); demographic and economic; phenomena produced by the diverse consequences of the advancing scientific and technological revolution; and new processes in the sphere of ideology.

The rise of the student movement is one of the main symptoms of the further aggravation of the general socio-political crisis in some capitalist countries, and a factor accelerating the formation of a broad opposition to the ruling circles' line.

The young people's active participation in the general democratic struggle also has an effect on the main line of the proletariat's class battles in the capitalist world, on the socio-economic sphere, the political sphere and the front of ideological struggle.

Broad masses of students have come out above all against the backward system of education, and for the right to set up their own organisations and have a say in running the centres of education.

A large section of the students are unable to complete their education: between 30 and 57 per cent of those enrolled in institutions of higher learning in Japan and France are forced to become dropouts; in Italy this is the lot of two students in three. The cost of tuition, books and study aids is high. The steady growth in the cost of transporta-

* *Cahiers du Communisme*, No. 4, 1969, p. 64.

** *L'Unità*, December 22, 1968, p. 13.

tion and housing hits hard at the poor students. Very few receive grants, which are extremely small. In Japan, more than one-half of the students have to work; in France, almost 44 per cent; and in Italy nearly 50 per cent. However, in capitalist society the degree obtained at the price of intense effort and privation is no guarantee of a job, to say nothing of a job in one's chosen line. In Italy, for instance, 42 out of every 100 unemployed youths are university or technical-institute graduates.

Consequently, the students are increasingly faced with socio-economic and socio-political barriers, which is why their discontent is directed at the education based on *class* lines, instead of this or that aspect of the system of education. The demands to restructure the secondary and higher schools, to review the archaic curricula, and so on, have gone hand in hand with demands for larger appropriations for education (which means a reallocation of the state budget), a fundamental change in the government's social policy (for instance, grants for all those who wish to study), and democratic planning for the training and employment of specialists.

However, the most powerful springs behind the students' protest which make it so radical lie deeper than mere discontent with the flaws of the capitalist system of education. The overwhelming majority of students today are destined to join the ranks of the intelligentsia, especially such of its categories as engineers and technicians at enterprises, and white-collar workers at computing, design and planning bureaus in industry. These groups already find that their working conditions and status within the relations-of-production system are very close to those of the working class, and that some of them are a component part of that class.* Other categories of the intelligentsia—teachers and lecturers, researchers, medical men and officials, screen workers and publishing house employees, and so on, equally having no property in the means of production, find themselves variously removed from the process of material produc-

* The French 1962 census gives some idea of the proportion of these groups of the intelligentsia in present-day capitalist society: 2.1 per cent of the working population, or about 5 per cent of the working class (A. Casanova, "Le statut social des intellectuels", *La Nouvelle critique*, No. 19, 1968, pp. 4-11).

tion and subjected to exploitation in somewhat different forms.*

More active protest and struggle is the working intellectuals' response to the pervading oppression by the monopolies and the state, the mounting exploitation and the specialists' labour being deprived of its creative essence. Thus, the 80,000-strong Draughtsmen's and Allied Technicians' Association has won fame as one of the most militant in the British trade union movement: in the recent period it has repeatedly sparked off strikes against the Wilson Government's intention to adopt anti-labour legislation. Some sections of the technical intelligentsia and workers in the arts had a noticeable part to play in the May 1968 strike in France. In the summer of 1968, there was a considerable response to the long strike by designers, engineers and technicians at SNAM, which is a part of the government ENI trust. Strikes by school teachers, journalists, publishing workers and various categories of government officials have long since ceased to be a rarity in some capitalist countries. In the recent period, this working-class weapon has also been used by college teachers in the USA, France, Italy and other countries. Thus, at one time only a potential opposition to state-monopoly capitalism, the mass of intellectuals has been developing into an open opposition of which the students are an active section.

In some countries, social and political life has been focused on student action for various periods. In the USA, where the movement has been developing since the early 1960s, the public was astounded by the vigour and radicalism of student action—first, in support of the struggle for Negro civil rights, then against the Vietnam policy of the Administration, and finally, against the very foundations of the "American way of life", which is sacrosanct for the philistine. Student action was in no sense confined to verbal criticism: students took over university buildings, and blockaded induction stations, among other things. Although US observers estimate Left-wing radical youth organisations in the USA to number about 200,000 persons, 46 per cent of the students, that is, over 2.5 million took part in the demonstrations and other forms of struggle. The student move-

* The same source estimates these groups of intelligentsia at a total of 28 per cent of France's working population (*ibid.*, p. 10).

ment has essentially become an important organised force opposing the Administration's Vietnam policy, so that the Vietnam problem, contrary to the will of the ruling circles, became a central issue in the 1968 electoral campaign.

During the 1968 political crisis in France, the students, with the support of the working class, came out against the regime of personal power. Almost throughout the year, the students were engaged in desperate clashes with the forces of "law and order" which now and again developed into pitched battles with barricades, hurling of paving stones, burning of cars and a great many wounded. Dozens of cities were the scene of demonstrations by thousands of students.

In Italy, not only the proletariat's struggle, but also the young people's large-scale action served as a factor behind the general shift to the Left in the whole political situation. For months, participants in the movement occupied university and school buildings. At some stages of the struggle they had control of virtually all the institutions of higher learning in the country. Up to 500,000 persons took part in this action.

In the FRG, university disorders broke out in the spring of 1967, and at once took the form of extremely sharp action against anti-democratic practices, the Bonn government's revenge-seeking policy, and its solidarity with the Vietnam aggression by the USA. Headed by Left-wing radical groups, the movement soon developed into one of the main forces of the extra-parliamentary opposition. The students constituted the bulk in the original action taken against the Springer concern and the resurgence of neo-nazis. Evidence of the great impact by the student movement on the public is the authorities' fierce police reprisals against its participants.

The student movement in Japan assumed acute forms in 1967-69. In the course of several months in 1969, the students took over the University of Tokyo and held it. The Japanese police used helicopters, tear gas, powerful water cannon and other modern means of combat to dislodge the students. Events took a similar turn at the University of Osaka and at several other campuses. The slogans put forward by ultra-Left groups, heading the movement, called for an immediate and radical reform of education, "schools for all", and free tuition at every level, and urged the young people to mount an "attack on the power" at once.

Political radicalism has become a distinctive feature of many youth and student manifestations in Belgium, Holland, Britain, Sweden and a number of other capitalist countries.

The consistent and purposeful advance of the student movement is seriously hampered by its lack of experience of socio-economic and political struggle. In contrast to the class-conscious proletariat, the students frequently lack the correct understanding of the ways of fighting capitalism. A sizable section of the students believe present-day state-monopoly capitalism to be a system capable of neutralising, swallowing up, "integrating" and "taming" any organised opposition, and this makes radical-minded students recognise nothing but methods of "guerrilla" warfare, and "direct", mainly violent, action.

Some ultra-Left students insist that the revolutionary vanguard merely operates as a detonator. This means that the students who play this part, must, without regard for the situation, cause an explosion, a revolutionary crisis, letting the masses "grow up" in the course of the revolution itself. This ultra-revolutionary attitude, which is nothing but fear of almighty capitalism, now and again leads the student movement to support objectively anti-democratic slogans, a revival of anarchist demands, and so on.

These attitudes among the ideologists of the "student revolution" left their mark on the relations between the working class and the student movement, especially when highly active ultra-Left groups, seeking to impose their own ideas on the working class, acted on behalf of the student movement. However, the working-class movement and its Marxist-Leninist vanguard do not consider these weaknesses either insuperable or equally inherent in the whole mass of students. The 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties said: "Communists think highly of the upsurge of the youth movement and actively participate in it. They propagate in its ranks the ideas of scientific socialism, explaining the danger of various pseudo-revolutionary ideas, which could influence young people, and seeking to help young people find the right path in the struggle against imperialism and for defence of their interests. Only close unity with the working-class movement and its Communist vanguard can open for them truly revolutionary prospects."*

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 26.

This alliance is being prepared not only by objective prerequisites and community of basic interests, but also by the concrete action taken by the working class, and by the purposeful policy of its Marxist-Leninist Parties and trade unions. Remarkable evidence of the proletariat's loyalty to its historical mission of leadership of the revolutionary movement came, for instance, from the great strike and manifestation of solidarity with the students staged by the working class of France on June 7, 1968. The workers of Genoa, Pisa, Florence and dozens of other cities of Italy repeatedly downed tools and marched through the streets in fraternal support of the students. Under pressure from the Communists and other Left-wing parties, the Italian Parliament passed in the autumn of 1968 an amnesty law under which dozens of youth and student leaders escaped trial and imprisonment for "anti-government action".

Other forms of support by the working-class parties to the student movement (granting the use of premises and printing shops, exposure in the progressive press of the slanderous inventions of bourgeois propaganda, and so on) are also highly important. It is indicative that in some instances the Communist press was not only the sole source of truth and information for the students besieged at the universities and institutes they took over, but also a means of organisation. Finally, the Communists proved to be the most consistent fighters for a radical restructuring of the education system, democratisation of all its stages, and free access to all institutions of learning for the children of the working people.

All this necessarily has an effect on the feelings and views of student youth, and is expressed in particular in the marked strengthening of Communist student organisations, and a decline in the influence of all sorts of "ultra-Left" groups. "About one hundred thousand students, roughly one-third of all those who took part in the poll, voted for the 7,000 candidates of UNEF-Renouveau (Renewed National Union of French Students, of which Communists are also members—*Authors.*)," says the French bourgeois journal *L'Express*. "The Leftists have been losing their influence in the organisations. . . ." * DuBois Clubs, organisations of Marxist youth in the USA, have been playing a more active

* *L'Express*, March 24, 1969, pp. 3-4.

part in the struggle of US students. Evidence of the growing Communist influence on Italian students comes from this fact: a social study of participants in the movement (mostly of non-proletarian stock) at Milan University showed that whereas in 1965 and 1966 only six per cent of those polled considered themselves supporters of the Communist Party and the Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity, in 1968 almost 28 per cent voted for these parties.*

The Marxists-Leninists regard the strengthening of their political-organisational ties with the student movement as an important prerequisite for effective working-class assistance to their student allies, consisting above all in the proletarian vanguard's showing the students the real prospects in the struggle against capitalism. Addressing a 100,000-strong meeting of young people in France, Jacques Duclos said: "Today, when we are faced with the need of implementing important political change, we consider it necessary to give the young people of France a reminder that Lenin, the great revolutionary strategist, urged young people to study communism."**

Assimilation of the ideas of scientific communism by student youth in the capitalist countries and by other allies of the working class helps them to shed some of their inherent weaknesses and the futile "revolutionism" of a part of their leaders, and to raise the whole anti-monopoly, anti-imperialist movement to a higher stage under the Communist Party's leadership.

* *Problemi del socialismo*, No. 31, 1968, pp. 653, 662.

** *Komsomolskaya Pravda*, May 27, 1969.

V

THE WORKING CLASS OF THE DEVELOPING COUNTRIES

The Communists proceed from the fact that the national liberation movement is an important revolutionary force of our day. Its importance is determined above all by the fact that it ranges over three vast continents inhabited by the majority of the globe's population. In terms of political tasks, the national liberation movement is a natural ally of the international working class in its struggle against imperialism, every form of national and racial oppression, against war, and for peace and friendship among nations.

As Lenin anticipated, the problem of the oppressed peoples' liberation comes to more than eliminating the colonial regimes. Once the political inequality of the former colonial world is made good, once the overwhelming majority of the former colonies and semi-colonies gain independence, the national liberation struggle is spearheaded against imperialist exploitation and economic oppression, against the economic backwardness and poverty, and attainment of all-round socio-economic progress.

"In most of the independent Asian and African states," the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties said, "along with the task of consolidating and safeguarding political independence and sovereignty, the central problems of social progress are to overcome economic backwardness, set up an independent national economy, including their own industry, and raise the people's standard of living. The solution of these problems involves far-reach-

ing socio-economic changes, the implementation of democratic agrarian reforms in the interests of the working peasantry and with its participation, the abolition of outdated feudal and prefeudal relations, liquidation of oppression by foreign monopolies, radical democratisation of social and political life and the state apparatus, regeneration of national culture and the development of its progressive traditions...^{**} As for the task facing the Latin American peoples, "the struggle for genuine national sovereignty and economic independence is intertwined with an acute class struggle against capitalist exploitation and, above all, against the foreign or local monopolies and latifundists".^{**}

Now that the young developing states have entered a new stage of the anti-imperialist liberation revolution, a stage of struggle to consolidate their political independence and win economic independence, the general tasks and the specific features of the national liberation movement in every area of Asia, Africa and Latin America clearly stand out.

For the time being, most of the countries which had once been colonies and semi-colonies remain within the orbit of the world capitalist economy. The system of economic ties, which imperialism has set up and which is based on an inequitable division of labour, keeps reproducing the master-and-servant relationship. That is why all the developing countries have one common enemy—world imperialism, headed by US imperialism.

The countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America have different socio-economic levels, with a considerable gap between them in some indicators (per capita national income, percentage of employment in manufacturing, percentage of urban population, literacy, and so on).

Of considerable importance also is the fact that there is a wide variety of socio-economic structures in their national economy. Besides, some areas (as in Asia and North Africa) still have survivals of feudal and caste relations, while other areas (like Africa south of the Sahara) still have tribal structures exerting a strong influence on the whole of socio-political life.

The political structure of the developing countries likewise presents a mixed picture within whose framework there

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 28.

** *Ibid.*, p. 29.

are feudal-theocratic regimes, reactionary military dictatorships, multi-party systems operating with a vestige of bourgeois-democratic freedoms, and revolutionary democratic states. There is also a wide range of ideological trends.

The specific combination of objective and subjective conditions in this area has resulted in the greatest influence now being enjoyed by various ideological trends usually displaying the flag of nationalism. In town and country, their social base is the bourgeoisie, the petty-bourgeois and intermediate sections, including handicraftsmen, small traders, white-collar workers, members of the liberal professions, and great masses of peasants.

One of the consequences of the accelerated pace of economic development in the young liberated countries is an increase in the percentage of industrial and office workers among the working population, and the emergence of new contingents of the proletariat even in the remotest areas of Asia, Africa and Latin America.

In 1960, the army of wage workers in the developing countries totalled about 140-145 million, and in 1968, 185-190 million. Today, almost 30 per cent of those who work are industrial and office workers and groups of similar status.

In the young national states, the wage-labour army has now become an important factor of socio-political life. But whereas in the developed capitalist countries industrial and office workers average 80 per cent of the working population, in the former colonies and semi-colonies they come to no more than 30 per cent.

Let us note that the average figures given above obscure the profound distinctions in terms of the people's proletarianisation by continent and by country. For example, over 60 per cent of the working population in Latin America are wage workers, but no more than 30 per cent in Asia, and even less than 20 per cent in Africa. A comparison by country produces even more striking results. For instance, almost 70-75 per cent of the working population are industrial and office workers in Chile, Argentina, Uruguay, Mexico, Costa-Rica and Venezuela, and not more than 2-4 per cent in Upper Volta, Dahomey, Niger, Chad, Ethiopia, Togo and Mali. What is more, even within the framework of each continent, there is a very great gap in socio-economic levels, including the extent of proletarianisation. Thus, in Latin

America, the figure for Argentina or Chile is six times higher than for Haiti, and in Africa, the figure for the UAR is 15 or 16 times higher than for Mali or Chad.

It would, of course, be wrong in each concrete instance to establish a direct relation between the comparable data characterising proletarianisation, and the potential possibilities and intensity of the anti-imperialist struggle. However, it is equally obvious that the deep-going socio-economic processes, which are reflected in the growing numbers and percentage of the wage-labour army, the industrial proletariat above all, have an effect on the character, forms and specifics of the national liberation movement and the class struggle in this or that country.

In structure, the wage-labour army consists of three main elements: industrial proletariat; office workers, officials and allied groups; plantation workers, day-labourers, farmhands and so on. There are substantial distinctions in the objective status and class consciousness of each of these contingents of the wage-labour army in Asia, Africa and Latin America, and these have an effect on the principal tendencies and prospects of the class struggle.

The accelerated process of proletarianisation of the various sections of the population, the steady growth of prices, which hit all wage workers, the unfavourable state of the labour market and the continued relative overpopulation in town and country all inevitably go to create a community of interests of the main contingents of wage workers. At the same time, whereas in the developing countries there are signs of a tendency for some indicators of the economic and social conditions of industrial and office workers to move closer together, there are still considerable elements of privilege in the socio-economic and political conditions of most officials, middle-bracket office workers, and so on. In addition, imperialism, the local oligarchy and the ruling élite resort to various methods of corrupting some sections of the office workers, making wide use of demagoguery in their efforts to maintain the illusion that these groups of wage workers enjoy a higher social status.

The full significance of this policy of the imperialists and the oligarchy in a number of countries in Asia, Africa and Latin America can be understood only if account is taken of the fact that in the non-agricultural sector of the economy the modern proletariat is somewhat less numerous than the

office workers, officials and similar status groups in trade and the services.

Agricultural workers employed on capitalist plantations and farms, on "semi-capitalist" landowner and kulak farms constitute the most numerous contingent of the wage-labour army. In Asia, Africa and Latin America, there are at least 85-90 million farmhands and day-labourers (that is, 8-9 times more than in the developed capitalist states) constituting almost 45 per cent of all wage workers. Most agricultural workers still hold tiny land allotments or cling to the remains of their "own" farms, and this inevitably helps to perpetuate private-property illusions and preconceptions. In many instances, the farmhands and day-labourers are exploited not only by capitalist, but also by semi-feudal methods. That is why they usually reveal the contradictory features of the proletariat and the petty proprietor.

All these factors have a bearing on the nature of the demands put forward and the activity of working peoples' organisations and associations. On the one hand, like the industrial workers, the farmhands and the day-labourers demand higher wages, shorter working hours, the basic benefits of labour legislation, freedom of trade union activity, and so on. On the other hand, most agricultural workers, together with the bulk of the peasantry, are carrying on a struggle for agrarian reform, for land, for farms of their own, and against commercial enslavement and debt bondage. In this guise they are, consequently, acting like semi-proletarians seeking to become petty proprietors.

The dual status of most agricultural workers, together with their relative dispersal over a great many plantations, farms and estates scattered over a vast territory, creates serious difficulties in organising farmhands and day-labourers, and in preparing the conditions for the unity of industrial and agricultural workers in their joint struggle against imperialism, and for social and economic progress.

The modern proletariat, connected with the large-scale machine industry, and concentrated at the mines, factories, plants, railways and large construction sites, constitutes the backbone of the wage-labour army in the developing countries. It is a consistent fighter against every form of exploitation and national and social oppression.

Some 35-40 million modern-type workers are now employed in industry, building and transport in the countries

of Asia, Africa and Latin America; they constitute just under 20 per cent of the total wage-labour army. As industrialisation goes forward, the industrial proletariat tends to grow faster than any other section of the wage workers. National statistics and UN data indicate that over the last 30 years the number of workers in manufacturing in the developing countries has increased roughly three-fold, while the population and the working population have less than doubled.*

Of course, the absolute and relative growth of the industrial working class in the various countries is uneven. All other conditions being equal, it is largely determined by the general level and direction of socio-economic development, the nature of the regimes in power, specifics of their economic policies, extent of imperialist influence on the attitude of the ruling circles, and (last but not least) the scale of economic co-operation between the developing country concerned and countries within the socialist system. The importance of the latter factor becomes especially obvious considering that almost 2,500 installations have been built or are being built in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America, with the help of the socialist countries. When these enterprises are started, production capacities in the recipient countries will be increased, as compared with 1960, by more than 100 per cent in steel smelting, 130 per cent in oil refining, over 33 per cent in electric-power generation, almost 20 per cent in cement output, and roughly 33 per cent in sugar output.**

Hundreds of thousands of workers, with the required occupational and technical training, will be employed at the factories, plants, oil fields, power stations, railways and irrigation networks, which have been built or are being built with the help of the socialist countries. In other words, the economic assistance of the USSR and other socialist countries has become an important factor in increasing the numerical strength of the modern proletariat, and creating the prerequisites for its greater role in the economic and political life of the young independent states.

* *World Economy and International Relations*, Russ. ed., No. 3, 1969, pp. 148-55.

** *World Socialism and Developing Countries*, Russ. ed., Moscow, 1969, pp. 15-16.

The rapid replenishment and renewal of working-class ranks (only in the last 15-20 years their numbers in the countries of Asia and Africa have increased 70-75 per cent, and in Latin America, more than 100 per cent) mean the involvement of millions of recent peasants and handicraftsmen in modern industry, and their acceptance of the traditions of the working-class movement. The appearance of factories and plants, mines and oil fields in backward areas earlier outside the sphere of modern economic life inevitably helps to awaken broad masses of the population from their parochial torpor, draw them into the socio-political struggle, and extend the proletariat's possibility of setting class alliances with the urban lower classes and the peasants.

At the same time, there is a temporary decline in the relative size of the regular core of the industrial proletariat—the natural vehicle of revolutionary traditions and experience of class struggle—in countries where industry, building and the infrastructure develop most rapidly. This creates conditions for the penetration of bourgeois feelings and reformist illusions into the ranks of the rapidly growing working class. In view of this the representatives of the class-conscious vanguard seek in painstaking day-to-day work to educate the recent peasants and handicraftsmen in the spirit of the proletariat's revolutionary traditions.

The potential possibilities of the working-class movement are largely determined by the industrial and territorial concentration of the proletariat. In most developing countries where factory industry has been developed, the concentration of workers in production is fundamentally no different from what it is in Western Europe and North America. Enterprises with 500 workers and over in the UAR employ roughly 45-50 per cent; in India, 50-55 per cent; in Iran, 35-40 per cent; in Argentina, 40 per cent; in Brazil, over 33 per cent; and in Mexico and Indonesia, over 25 per cent of all industrial and office workers employed at factories and plants.

In most developing countries the geographical deployment of industry is quite specific. Under colonialism, and direct or indirect dependence on imperialism, the territorial structure of industry, largely owned by foreign capital, usually reflected its export-import orientation. Industrial enterprises were most frequently sited in the main ports, capitals and two or three largest cities. Over a long period, this

lop-sided arrangement was reproduced again and again, creating an ever widening gap in socio-economic levels (and consequently in the level of the proletariat's development) between the various areas of the same country.

Under independence, industrialisation is connected above all with an expansion of the domestic market. However, the historically rooted and highly uneven industrial development in the individual areas cannot be righted in a short while, and so continues to exert an influence on the main indicators of urban proletarian growth. Thus, more than one-half of all those employed at UAR factories and plants are concentrated at Cairo and Alexandria. Of course, this high territorial concentration of the working class is not a general rule, but even where the indicators are much lower, extremely uneven distribution of the modern proletariat is an obvious feature.

All this naturally leaves its mark on the development of the working-class movement: the concentration of tens and even hundreds of thousands of workers at large enterprises, which are usually situated in capitals, ports and a few big cities, multiplies the effectiveness of strikes, demonstrations and other mass action by the proletariat in the principal "nerve centres", which largely shape a country's economic and political life. At the same time, the uneven spread of industry and the modern proletariat in a sense confines the working-class movement to a relatively narrow territorial framework and hampers the workers' alignment with broad proletarian and non-proletarian masses in the rural areas and small towns.

As the one-time colonies and semi-colonies develop freely, there are on the whole ever more pronounced tendencies promoting the cohesion, consolidation and greater class maturity of the modern proletariat, facilitating its struggle for leadership among the broad masses of the working people. But the vast potential of the working class can only be realised if sober account is taken of the existing difficulties arising from the fact that the formation of the working class is incomplete and that its individual contingents lack social and economic maturity. Thus, in many countries of Africa the overwhelming majority of the workers have just escaped from the narrow world of the rural community, and have yet to shed all the habits, beliefs and prejudices induced by that environment. Workers coming from different ethnic groups frequently

eye each other with suspicion, keep to their own group of fellow-villagers or tribesmen, and remain under the influence of tribalist organisations.

The migration system, which imperialism set up and has been reproducing for decades in many areas of Africa south of the Sahara, keeps workers, even those who have been working in industry for years, from developing into modern-type proletarians and breaking off all their production and everyday ties with the countryside and peasant labour. The high turnover of manpower in the pits, mines and even factories is a serious drag on the formation of a constant proletarian core and establishment of trade unions and political organisations.

At the same time, there is a marked tendency in the more developed countries of Latin America, Asia and North Africa towards some social differentiation within the working class itself.

At present, a relatively thin layer of highly skilled workers, usually involving not more than 5-15 per cent of all those employed at large enterprises, has taken shape or is in the making. Their wages are 2-4 times higher than those of the bulk of unskilled labour, they have much greater social insurance benefits, and are not beset by fear of redundancy whenever business activity declines. Consequently, some prerequisites have been created for the top layer of skilled workers falling away from the mass of proletarians, and its transformation into a kind of workers' aristocracy, which has long existed in the developed capitalist countries.

However, some reservations should be made at this point. For one thing, the "privileged" status of this group of workers is a highly relative one, and their family income, although it is substantially in excess of the extremely low wages of general workers and day-labourers, at best more or less corresponds to the full price of their labour power, and in fact most frequently falls short of it. Having committed themselves for life to work in industry and become regular proletarians, they are naturally in a position to develop the proletarian mentality and discipline much faster. The highly skilled proletarians, more literate and better trained, have easier access to modern culture and science, which enables them consciously to adopt its supreme achievement: the Marxist-Leninist theory of social development.

In these conditions, day-to-day organisational, political and ideological work among skilled proletarians can, Marxists-Leninists believe, turn them into the mainstay of the progressive trade unions and proletarian Parties; conversely, when they are neglected it makes it easier for the bourgeoisie to use them as vehicles for its influence on the working class.

Following the winning of independence, there has been a substantial change in the condition of the working class in the countries of Asia and Africa. A new situation has been produced by the overall acceleration of economic development, proclamation of democratic freedoms in some countries, and forced recognition by ruling groups of some inalienable socio-economic rights of the working people. To some extent this has made easier the workers' organisation and struggle for higher wages, for progressive social legislation and deep-going social change. Under pressure from the working-class movement, laws on the eight-hour working day and weekly holidays have been proclaimed and partially implemented in almost all the emergent countries, and laws on annual paid holidays, in many countries. There has been a gradual introduction of some elements of social insurance and security, and some measures to restrict arbitrary practices by employers in labour protection, imposition of fines, overtime, and so on.

In most developing countries, the working people have secured the right, if only in formal terms, to set up their own trade unions and other associations, and where this right had been won earlier (as in Latin America), to engage in collective bargaining and have trade unions participate in framing social legislation programmes; in these countries trade unions are uniting on the sectoral, national and regional levels. Despite the obstacles and restrictions, industrial and office workers in Asia, Africa and Latin America have set up powerful trade unions. In the second half of 1960s, trade unions in Latin America had almost 14 million members; in Asia, 12 million, and in Africa, 5 million. In Argentina, Chile, Uruguay, Venezuela, Mexico, India, Ceylon, Morocco and the UAR, one-half and more of the industrial and transport workers are unionised.

In order to accelerate the economic growth, the governments of the liberated countries have made serious efforts to extend the school network, and this has helped markedly

to raise the level of literacy of the urban and partially of the rural young people who swell the ranks of the proletariat and in some instances make up between one-third and one-half of all industrial, building and transport workers. A reduction of the working week, and some growth in literacy and skills have resulted in a considerable increase in the volume of the proletarians' needs.

The dynamics of wages has been highly contradictory and has in no sense reflected the objective tendency for the cost of labour power to grow. In the second half of the 1950s, the working-class struggle in most liberated countries pushed up real wages some 20-50 (and more) per cent above the extremely low pre-war level, but in the years that followed the predominant tendency in the developing countries has been towards a reduction of real wages. Estimates based on official data show that from 1960 to 1968 the real earnings of industrial and office workers in many liberated countries dropped by 10-20 per cent, a major cause behind the rise of the strike struggle in the main developing countries.

There, the proletariat's struggle has been going forward in various forms. Economic and political strikes have gone hand in hand with numerous demonstrations and rallies, and in some instances workers' action is combined with action by other sections of the working people in town and country, and assumes a general political character. Official statistics usually distort the true nature and scale of the working-class movement, but it is estimated that whereas between 1948 and 1957 there were more than 31,000 strikes in the developing countries, in the ten years after that the figure went up to 82,000.

The strike struggle has spread to all, even the most backward countries and heartland areas where the first industrial enterprises were erected but recently, and where the history of the working class runs to no more than a few years. Massiveness has become the most important feature of the working-class movement. Two main tendencies stand out: on the one hand, a great number of strikes has been staged at relatively small or medium enterprises, in the most diverse industries of branches of the infrastructure; on the other hand, in the last few years between 50 and 70 per cent of all strikers took part in a few dozen of the largest strikes which sometimes involve thousands of industrial and office workers.

The working people employed in the "traditional" branches

of the economy (plantations, mining, the light and food industry) and having considerable experience in the class struggle continue to be the most active in the strike movement. At the same time, ever greater importance now attaches to action by workers connected with modern heavy industries and transport. In some instances, the strike movement in the chemical, engineering, oil and similar other industries was no different in scale from the struggle by textile workers, railwaymen and plantation workers. However, as in the past, workers in the industries falling within Department II (production of consumer goods) and also at plantation-type agricultural enterprises on the whole continue to lead in the massiveness of strikes and the number of working days lost.

In the last 10-15 years, the most important feature of the strike struggle in the developing countries has been the growing participation of office workers, teachers, medical workers, junior officials and other groups of wage workers engaged mainly in the services and trade. Because of the virtually non-stop inflation, the real wages of teachers, medical personnel and clerical workers have a tendency to fall, so that there is a gradual closing of the gap between the wage levels of industrial workers and the lower-bracket office workers. In their efforts to improve their economic condition, office workers, petty officials and teachers ever more frequently unite in trade unions and resort to proletarian methods of struggle. From 1966 to 1968, these groups of wage workers are estimated to have staged 30 to 40 per cent of all the strikes in most countries of Asia and Latin America. In India, for instance, office workers, teachers, petty officials, municipal workers, and so on, make up more than one-half of all those who took part in strikes in 1966 and 1967.

Evidence that the working-class movement in 1966-1969 rose to a new and higher stage came from the nation-wide strikes in countries like Argentina, Uruguay, Chile, Ceylon and Pakistan.

Finally, at least a quarter of all the strikes carried political slogans from the start. Where industrial and office workers employed by foreign enterprises took part in the strikes, their demands, even if economic ones, acquired an anti-imperialist tenor. Working people employed at mines, oil fields and plants owned by foreign monopolies increas-

ingly supported slogans calling for a strong curb on the activity of these monopolies or their complete nationalisation.

The massive drawn-out and stubborn struggle by industrial and office workers made many strikes a success. From 1966 to 1968, at least 20-30 per cent of all strikes ended in full or partial victory for the strikers, who secured satisfaction of their main demands. Of course, under capitalism, whose development goes hand in hand with steadily rising prices, spread of massive unemployment and under-capacity working, the employers frequently manage to nullify many of the concessions they had to make under strike pressure. However, even the temporary successes scored by the workers show the extensive possibilities opened up by joint action of various contingents of the proletariat, and joint efforts by trade unions and progressive political parties in the struggle to satisfy the working people's vital demands. On the whole, the social role and political activity of the working class have grown, especially in Latin America.

But for the many objective and subjective obstacles, the successes of the working-class movement could have been much greater. The incomplete process of working-class formation, the split in the trade union movement, the continued influence of petty-bourgeois and even bourgeois-landowner parties among some sections of the workers, and finally, the absolute predominance of semi-proletarian and non-proletarian masses in the population of the developing countries—all these and similar other factors in themselves seriously hamper the attainment of the goals before the modern proletariat. In addition, imperialism and the ruling circles of many developing countries, using different methods—from outright violence to corruption and softening-up of vacillating trade union leaders—seek to damp down the class struggle, to split the working-class movement, and reduce the influence of the best men of the working class who have adopted Marxism-Leninism. That explains the bitterness of the temporary reverses and the heavy losses suffered by some national contingents of the proletariat.

In these conditions, especial importance attaches to the role and responsibility of the Communists, who give the fullest and most consistent expression to the proletariat's true interests. Lenin saw the task of the Marxists in the developing countries in raising "the working masses to revolutionary activity, to independent action and to organisa-

tion, regardless of the level they have reached...".* Considering that in the developing countries it is not necessarily the Workers' or the Communist Parties that would play the leading part in the liberation struggle, and that other social forces and parties could tackle this task, Lenin believed that in these conditions the Communists should secure the establishment of a united anti-imperialist, democratic front, co-operate with these forces and make every effort to induce them to carry out progressive socio-economic changes.

The Communists are the vanguard of the working-class movement. In the struggle for the cause of the working class and all the other working people they have shown themselves to be superbly heroic and steadfast. They lead the proletariat's class action, and work out programmes for national fronts and struggle for the non-capitalist way of development. In their struggle they always look to Lenin and Leninism, which they regard as a powerful theoretical weapon. Member of the Executive Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay José Luis Massera says: "Lenin's works are an inexhaustible source for the revolutionaries of our epoch. All the organisations of the Communist Party of Uruguay see it as their main task to have not only Party members, but broad masses of the Uruguayan working people obtain a knowledge of Lenin's writings and activity."**

In face of the mounting aggressiveness of imperialism and the criminal war waged by the USA in Indo-China, the working class in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America has been ever more actively joining in the anti-imperialist struggle. There is a growing solidarity movement among the working people with the heroic people of Vietnam, and with the peoples fighting against aggression and against colonial and racist regimes. In Latin America, there is growing working people's solidarity with the heroic Cuban people. The proletariat of the developing countries is taking part in the struggle for disarmament, easing of international tensions, and co-operation with all countries irrespective of social system.

Where the imperialists have managed to install anti-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 162.

** *Popular*, April 20, 1969.

popular regimes, the working class, its parties and the trade unions have been intensifying their attacks in the fight to overthrow the pro-imperialist cliques, to secure genuine national sovereignty, and make political life more democratic. They demand an independent foreign policy, and broader economic and cultural relations with the socialist countries.

The working class of Pakistan, Turkey, Thailand and many Latin American countries has been campaigning ever more actively for withdrawal from imperialist military blocs and pacts. The progressive trade unions and the working-class parties have been tireless in exposing the colonialist essence of the "aid" coming from the imperialist states, and the anti-popular moves encroaching on the national sovereignty of the developing countries.

The Communist Parties and the class trade unions in the countries of Asia, Africa and Latin America are carrying on a struggle against the survivals of feudalism, and for agrarian reforms in the peasants' interests.

In view of the emergence in some countries of local monopoly groups, representing the most reactionary sections of the national bourgeoisie, the working class, and its trade unions and parties have intensified their struggle to bridle the monopolies and to restrict their influence on economic and political life. Thus, for instance, India's progressive trade unions mounted a massive campaign to nationalise the big banks, which are the monopolies' powerful means of controlling the economy. This demand was broadly supported by industrial and office workers and the intelligentsia.

The working class wants an extension of the state sector, opposes the penetration of private capital in the key industries and concessions to the monopolies, and demands greater rights for the trade unions and introduction of workers' co-management.

The proletariat and its class organisations demand democratic economic planning, the use of accumulations in the hands of the propertied sections for the needs of economic development and larger budget appropriations for national purposes, like financing agriculture, education, public health and social insurance.

Since the interests of the working class are identical with those of all democratic, patriotic forces, objective possibilities exist for establishing broader class alliances between

the proletariat and the peasantry, the small and middle bourgeoisie and the intermediate sections. Again and again, the working class acts as the initiator of the mass movements. L. I. Brezhnev told the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties: "It is the working-class movement that will ultimately play the decisive part in this area of the world too."* This conclusion is even truer of Latin America, where "the proletariat and the Communist and Workers' Parties play an increasingly important role in the anti-imperialist movement.... The existence and activity of the working class is an historic advantage and a guarantee of its further development".**

The working class faces new tasks in countries taking the non-capitalist way of development. The socio-economic reforms these independent states put through not only complete the general democratic anti-imperialist revolutions, but go beyond them, undermining the foundations of capitalist relations. The positions held by foreign capital in the economy are restricted and eliminated. The basic means of production, and in some countries even the banks and wholesale trade, are taken over by the state. The working people, the working class above all, are drawn into the management of enterprises.

A specific feature of this group of countries is the fact that it is not the working class but revolutionary, democratic elements that are in power. The latter are inclined to adopt socialist ideals, but the undeveloped class contradictions in these countries and the preconceptions of the petty-bourgeois environment from which they come now and again prevent them from seeing scientific socialism as a coherent doctrine.

The experience of socialist construction in the USSR and other socialist countries clearly shows that backward societies advance to socialism through a number of intermediate stages because socialism requires the productive forces to achieve a certain level of development. In contrast to capitalism, which can develop even on the basis of small-scale, splintered production, "the only possible economic foundation of socialism is large-scale machine industry".***

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 153.

** *Ibid.*, p. 30.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 32, p. 492.

As a social system, socialism cannot function without the proletariat, modern society's most advanced class, acting as a guiding and organising force.

In this context, tremendous importance attaches to Lenin's ideas about the ways of development for countries lagging in socio-economic terms. The emergence of a number of African and Asian countries with a socialist orientation, and their initial successes in putting through a series of deep-going reforms confirm "the Leninist conclusion that in our epoch the peoples who win liberation from colonial oppression can advance along the path of social progress by-passing capitalism. One of the most important conditions which make such development possible is co-operation between the progressive young states and the socialist countries".*

World socialism and the international working class, playing the part of the proletarian vanguard with respect to the national liberation movement, have been doing everything to ensure the triumph of the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America in their struggle for complete liberation from the economic, social and political fetters of imperialism, and for national independence and social progress.

More than half a century ago, Lenin wrote with reference to the nature of the Soviet Republic's future relations with its neighbours in the East: "We shall endeavour to render these nations, more backward and oppressed than we are, 'disinterested cultural assistance'.... In other words, we will help them pass to the use of machinery, to the lightening of labour, to democracy, to socialism."** True to their internationalist duty, the peoples of the Soviet Union and the other countries of the socialist community have been giving the countries of Asia and Africa large-scale assistance in developing their economy, science and culture. This assistance is of vast importance, because it helps the young states to make proper use of the national resources and to invest considerably more in economic development than would have been possible in other historical conditions.

The peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America have been constantly receiving political, material and military support

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 152.

** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 23, p. 67.

from the socialist states. Evidence of this comes from the consistent struggle by the countries of the socialist community against the machinations inspired by world imperialism in South-East Asia, against Israel's imperialist aims in the Middle East, and against the policy of reaction and neo-colonialism in other areas of the world.

John Gollan, General Secretary of the Communist Party of Great Britain, said in his speech at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in Moscow: "No one can speak to a national liberation leader without being told of the tremendous political and material aid of the Soviet Union and other socialist states."*

By giving support to the peoples of Asia, Africa and Latin America, the international working-class and communist movement has been following Lenin's precepts and consolidating the unity of all the revolutionary forces of our day, which is a pledge of victory in the struggle against imperialism, and for peace, democracy and social progress.

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 491.

VI LENINISM AND THE HISTORICAL FALLACY OF RIGHT AND "LEFT" OPPORTUNISM

The key issue in the sharpening ideological struggle between Marxists-Leninists and those who reject the basic propositions of the theory and practice of scientific communism is the role of the working class in historical development.

For all the differences between the Right and the "Left" adversaries of Leninism, they are frequently at one in their urge to deny or play down the mission of the working class in world history, which is to transform society on the principles of socialism and communism. The reformists seek to prove this by referring to "neo-capitalism" and the "mass consumption society", where class antagonisms are allegedly obliterated, so that the objective conditions for class struggle disappear. For their part, the "Left" critics of scientific communism insist that today it is the peasantry, or some groups of the intelligentsia, that have taken over the role of leading force behind social progress.

These pseudo-scientific conceptions have been repeatedly exploded by life itself. Let us recall that it was Lenin who performed the historic achievement of giving a full-scale analysis of the revolutionary potential of the peasantry, the working intelligentsia and other non-proletarian sections of the working people. But it was Lenin, too, who showed quite clearly that this revolutionary potential could be successfully realised and would play a progressive role only if the peasantry and the working intelligentsia acted together with

the working class, in close alliance with it, and under its political guidance.

The history of the last few decades has repeatedly proved untenable the various anti-Leninist conceptions designed to deprive the working people in the capitalist countries of their revolutionary prospects, to undermine the unity of the working class and other sections of the working people, and to weaken thereby its attacks against the forces of the old world of exploitation, war and oppression. Today, the struggle against Right and "Left" revisionism is the most important condition for the success of the world liberation movement and the further consolidation of its ranks.

**THE CRISIS OF SOCIAL-REFORMISM
AND PROBLEMS IN THE STRUGGLE
FOR THE UNITY
OF THE WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT**

In line with Lenin's precepts, the Communists, working out the strategy and tactics of the revolutionary working-class movement, have always proceeded from the view that if the working class is to score a victory over the bourgeoisie, its ranks must be united on the principled basis of the class struggle.

As in the past, the way to overcome the split in the working class today runs through a dialectical combination of the struggle for unity of all the contingents of the working-class movement, the Communists and the Social-Democrats above all, with principled criticism of social-reformist ideology and politics.

In order to establish correct relations between the Communist and the Social-Democratic Parties, the important thing is to bring out the political face of present-day Social-Democracy as an international movement and as a set of parties operating under state-monopoly capitalism. It is also important to find out whether the "complete integration" of the Social-Democratic workers with the neo-capitalist society is inevitable (as the Right-socialist leaders insist) or whether truth is on the side of the Communists, who urge the Socialist workers to seek ways for joint anti-monopoly struggle.

This brings up the legitimate question of the main criterion in evaluating Social-Democracy as a political whole.

If we are to obtain the correct answer, we should start by recalling the approach of Marx, Engels and Lenin in assessing the working-class party. In their 1879 *Circular Letter*, addressed to Bebel, Liebknecht and others, Marx and Engels sharply criticised the opportunist document issued by a group of prominent functionaries of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany which said that the party had to abandon the theory and practice of the class struggle. Marx and Engels showed these views to be highly dangerous, and added: "If these gentlemen constitute themselves into a Social-Democratic petty-bourgeois party they have a perfect right to do so; one could then negotiate with them, form a *bloc* according to circumstances, etc."* But, they emphasised, these men should not be allowed to influence the party leadership or its policy. They went on: "But if even the leadership of the Party should fall more or less into the hands of such people, the Party would simply be castrated and there would be an end of proletarian snap.... If the new Party organ adopts a line that corresponds to the views of these gentlemen, that is bourgeois and not proletarian, then nothing remains for us, much though we should regret it, but publicly to declare our opposition to it, and to dissolve the bonds of the solidarity with which we have hitherto represented the German Party abroad."**

We find that the founders of Marxism-Leninism saw the content of the Party's policy and the stand of its leadership as the most important criterion of its class character. Addressing the Second Congress of the Communist International, Lenin said that "whether or not a party is really a political party of the workers does not depend solely upon a membership of workers but also upon the men that lead it, and the content of its actions and its political tactics. Only this latter determines whether we really have before us a political party of the proletariat"***

In the light of these assessments, workers' parties dominated by Rightist leaders who have repudiated the principles of revolutionary struggle should be classed as petty-bourgeois workers' parties. In fact, such parties give a modified reflection of the objective contradictions in the

* Marx and Engels, *Selected Correspondence*, Moscow, 1965, p. 327.

** Ibid.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 257-58.

petty bourgeoisie, which has the marks both of the proprietor and of the labourer. In the Social-Democratic Parties it is expressed in the form of the contradiction between the Right-wing leadership's pro-capitalist policy, on the one hand, and the class interests and demands of the bulk of the membership, mainly workers by hand and by brain, on the other. This contradiction determines the internal development of Social-Democracy. It also explains, on the one hand, the alliances concluded by its Rightist leaders with the monopoly bourgeoisie, and their inability to express and defend the basic interests of the working class, and on the other, the measures, even if inconsistent and half-way, aimed at safeguarding the limited, current economic interests and sometimes the political rights of the working people, and also the possibility of co-operation at different levels and in diverse forms between the Communist Parties and socialist organisations.

The Communist Parties of Western Europe take account of this contradiction in their practical and theoretical activity. Thus, the French Communists, while recognising that the Socialist Party (SFIO) is a workers' party, add that "judging by its governing organs, at any rate, it displays considerably less concern than the Communists about advancing the working class and about its leading role in this process. . . . However, none of this can obscure the fact that there is in France a powerful Social-Democratic movement which sprang from a confluence of republican traditions and the socialist ideal . . . and that this trend varies in strength depending on the successes of the Left as a whole, including the Communists."^{*}

It should be taken into account that the Social-Democratic Parties include, besides Right-wing leaders and theorists, hundreds of thousands of working people, many of whom believe their leaders' promises to secure economic, social and political changes through an "improvement" of capitalism, and have yet to find the right way of struggle for genuine social progress. But the members of the Social-Democratic Parties are not an amorphous mass blindly following their leaders. The Social-Democrats will be unable to maintain their influence over some sections of the work-

^{*} *La Nouvelle critique*, No. 182, 1967, p. 21.

ing people unless they express, to whatever extent, even if in a twisted form, some of their aspirations and demands.

* * *

As the mass struggle gathers strength and the general crisis of capitalism becomes more acute, important changes take place in the Social-Democratic movement, reflecting above all the deepening contradictions between the Right-wing leaders' policies and the interests and aspirations of Social-Democratic workers. The result is that more and more rank-and-file Social-Democrats exert increasing pressure on their leaders, with a change of party policy as one of their demands. Analysing the main line and results of this process, the international communist movement has declared that millions of Social-Democrats and some Social-Democratic Parties have in one form or another come out in favour of solving the tasks which face the whole working class.* "The Communists take account of the fact that Social-Democracy has deep traditional roots in the working-class movement of the West, that it is one of its influential trends, and that it must not be indiscriminately regarded as consisting of 'agents of the bourgeoisie'. The Social-Democratic Parties—in some periods, at any rate—have managed to express the demands of the mass of workers, to lead them and to win definite positive results in what pertains to the working people's daily vital interests."**

Some Social-Democratic Parties, manoeuvring between the interests of the monopolies and the demands of the workers, have taken part in the movement for reforms and measures demanded by the working people. In particular, the Social-Democrats in Sweden, with the Communists' support, have secured the adoption of laws on the "people's pension" (which goes to every citizen upon the attainment of 67 years, and which is tied to the cost of living), on a four-week paid holiday, and free tuition in school.

In Denmark, as a result of the working people's long struggle, laws were adopted on higher pensions for disabled persons and grants to children and single mothers; on a three-week paid holiday, and exemption of the working

* *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, Moscow, p. 72.

** *Pravda*, February 4, 1965.

people in the lowest brackets from taxes. These measures were not only supported by all the working-class organisations in the country, including the Communists and the Socialists, but were put through under their pressure. In view of workers' demands in Britain, the Labourites secured passage of a law on compulsory and free education of children, free medical service, payment of aids (sick and unemployment benefits, old-age pensions, aids for children, beginning with the second child), and some ceilings on rents. On these issues, the Labourites have the support of the mass trade union movement and the Communists.

Through joint action by various working people's organisations in France, the working class secured a 40-hour week, a fortnight's paid holiday, a considerable increase in aids and pensions for the old and the disabled, and the right to collective bargaining with the employers.

The implementation of a number of vital social working-class demands has enabled many Social-Democratic Parties to secure considerable political influence among a section of the working people. In 1967, there were roughly 17 million members of Social-Democratic Parties throughout the world. At present, more than 75 million people in the capitalist countries vote for Social-Democratic Party candidates.

However, the facts show that the political influence gained by Social-Democrats in the capitalist world has not become a factor in developing the working-class movement along socialist lines. Moreover, international Social-Democracy is in the grip of a profound crisis.

The start of the crisis dates to the period when the international working-class movement was split by the Right-wing Social-Democrats, that is, the First World War. Since then, the Social-Democrats have played a dual role. On the one hand, the Social-Democratic masses have retained not only a democratic but also a socialist potential. On the other hand, a sizable section of the Social-Democrats, their top leadership above all, perform a definite function within the mechanism of the dictatorship of state-monopoly capitalism, and let us add, not only when they are represented in the government, but also when they are in opposition.

The various forms in which the Right-opportunist elements of Social-Democracy are integrated with the capitalist regime testify to a definite orientation of the policy of

the monopoly bourgeoisie, which seeks to secure control of proletarian organisations, to deprive them of their independence, and to perpetuate the split in the working-class movement. This is one of the most important expressions of the class struggle today. To combat social-reformism today is to combat not only opportunist slogans of "growing into socialism" through petty reforms which do nothing to change the essence of capitalism. Increasing importance now attaches to the struggle against social-reformism coalescing with "neo-capitalism", and for the inalienable right of the working class to put an end to capitalist exploitation, and win economic and social emancipation.

In fact, the crisis of Social-Democracy, as a political entity, springs from this urge on the part of the Rightist leaders to "integrate" the whole Social-Democratic movement into the capitalist socio-economic structure.

In the sphere of *ideology*, this crisis is expressed in the fact that under the influence of its Rightist leaders, the Social-Democratic movement has openly repudiated Marxism. There are virtually no Marxist ideas or Marxist terminology in the new programmes adopted by the Social-Democratic Parties in the 1950s and 1960s. Instead there is a mixed bag of bourgeois conceptions, Christian maxims and old reformist views. This eclectic mixture is labelled "democratic socialism".

In the *political* sphere, the crisis of Social-Democracy is expressed in the abandonment of socialist traditions and fundamental working-class demands, and of any coherent programme for anti-monopoly political and socio-economic reform.

The ideological and political crisis of social-reformism has further aggravated the basic contradiction inherent in the Social-Democratic movement.

It is well-known that Social-Democratic theoretical constructions rest on the reformist thesis that in our day it is not revolution, but "evolution" that is the only form of advance from capitalism to socialism. The Italian Socialist Pietro Nenni says: "The very conception of revolution has been transformed into a conception of the democratic evolution of society seeking ever higher ... forms of civic coexistence."* Paul Ramadier, a French reformist ideologist,

* *Avanti!*, September 5, 1965.

is just as explicit: "The idea that social change is inevitably brought about by catastrophe and revolution, which derives from growing tension in social relations, no longer holds. Social progress is pursued by gradual easy climbs."*

The Right-wing socialist ideologists regard the struggle for socialism as a strictly evolutionary process which ensures an easy and imperceptible transformation of capitalism into socialism.

The latest Social-Democratic policy-making statements insist that the socio-economic and political structure of capitalist society today has nothing or virtually nothing in common with that analysed by Marx and Lenin. Right-wing Social-Democratic theoreticians allege that the most crying contradictions of the "old" capitalism have already been overcome, that the working class now enjoys the same rights as other classes, and so on. One English Marxist says that if we are to believe the Right-wing Social-Democrats "'post-war capitalism' had brought such fundamental changes to society that socialism no longer had any meaning".**

This sharp turn by the Rightist leaders of social-reformism towards more avowed support of "neo-capitalism" quite naturally met with rebuffs not only from the Communists, but also from Social-Democratic organisations, many of whose members hold socialism to be the ultimate goal of the working-class movement, and are coming to realise that the "neo-capitalist" reformism of the Rightist leaders is patently at variance with it.

Thus, there was noticeable resistance from Socialist workers to their leaders' attempt to drop from the programmes of some West European Social-Democratic Parties the points about the class struggle, the need to socialise the means of production, and so on (these have been retained in the Linz programme of the Socialist Party of Austria adopted in 1926, the Heidelberg programme of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany in 1925, among others). Indicative in this respect was the polemic in the Socialist Party of Austria (SPA), one of whose Rightist ideologists,

* *Socialist International Information*, Vol. VIII, No. 21-22, 24 May, 1958, p. 326.

** Emile Burns, *Right-Wing Labour. Its Theory and Practice*, London, 1961, p. 7.

Karl Czernetz, declared that "capitalism has undergone profound change" and "in the tide of changes in society there has started, on the material and ideological wreckage left by the Second World War and fascism, a gradual realisation of socialist demands in the new forms we find today".* To this, Fritz Koppe, representing the Socialist Youth organisation, replied: "The working-class movement has always demonstrated to its adversary and told the working people that the capitalists are to blame for things being in such a poor state at present. It has exposed the causes behind the collapse and ordeals of the individual. It not only set the goal but also indicated the adversary. I think that that is the kind of analysis that our programme lacks. Exploitation is still there."** Because this view was shared by many rank-and-file members, the SPA leadership had to reckon with it, and the programme adopted at the SPA Vienna Congress in May 1958 contains mention of classes and the class struggle.***

Most Social-Democratic policy-making statements devote considerable attention to substantiating the "democratic socialism" conception, as will be seen from the programmes of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, adopted at Bad-Godesberg in 1959, and the programmes of the Socialist Parties of France (1962), Belgium (1959), the Netherlands (1959), Sweden (1960), Denmark (1961) and Norway (1961).

In plugging this untenable doctrine, the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders are trying to escape a real historical dilemma: is it to be capitalism or socialism? But it is one thing to exclaim with false feeling: "We reject both communism and capitalism", and quite another to produce a positive socio-political conception clearly formulating scientifically grounded socialist goals and ways of attaining them.

Quite often "democratic socialism" is defined as a society "characterised by respect for the right of every citizen, in which freedom is allied to justice and the social system serves to promote the social and spiritual welfare of the

* Karl Czernetz, *Vor der Entscheidung. Welt in Wandlung, Sozialismus im Werden*, Vienna, 1957, p. 14.

** *Ausserordentlicher Parteitag der Sozialistischen Partei Osterreichs. Protokoll*, Vienna, 1958, p. 92.

*** *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, May 15, 1958.

individual and of the community".* Such vague definitions make it quite impossible to see the dividing line between capitalist and socialist society, or the objective criterion which warrants the assertion that "democratic socialism" is qualitatively distinct from an improved version of capitalism. That is what exposes the groundless claims of the Rightist Social-Democratic ideologists to be heralds of a "new and just system".

"The aim of Social-Democratic economic policy," says the programme of the Social-Democratic Party of Germany, "is steadily growing welfare and a fair share for all of the earnings of the national economy, life in freedom, without dependence and exploitation, which degrade man."** The task is formulated in similar terms by the Socialists of Austria: "The aim of the SPA is to establish an economy which combines, under broad democratic control, personal freedoms and planning, rational production and a fair distribution of the social product, and also assures all men of a livelihood."*** The Dutch Social-Democrats insist that "the economic system should be directed towards efficiency in providing the needs of the individual and the community, towards utilising to the full productive capacity and manpower, and towards a just distribution of income and wealth".**** Economic tasks are similarly formulated in the programmes of other West European Socialist and Social-Democratic Parties.

Of primary interest is the question of what the Socialists regard as the main obstacle to establishing an economic system that would promote the development of the full man. There are many nuances in their answers, but they all boil down to the same thing.

"The main task of a free economic policy is to put a check on the power of the representatives of the big economy," says the SDPG Programme. "The state and society should not fall prey to powerful groups held together by common interests",***** that is, to the monopolies (a term the German Social-Democrats studiously avoid), which hold

* *Socialist International Information*, Vol. X, No. 9, February 27, 1960, p. 133.

** *Vorwärts*, November 20, 1969.

*** *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, May 15, 1958.

**** *Socialist International Information*, No. 9, 1960 p. 137.

***** *Vorwärts*, November 20, 1959.

back the development of society's productive forces. The Austrian Socialists say that in order to achieve the economic aims set out in their programme, "it is necessary to transform the economic system, which is still being ruled by profit obtained through exploitation, into an economic system which serves the welfare of all".* The Dutch Social-Democrats emphasise that they fight "against the capitalist forces which, in spite of the changes that have taken place in our society, are still strong".**

While this reasoning is to some extent abstract, it does not quite warrant the charge of being an open apology of the capitalist system, and seems to point out the main adversary confronting the working class and acting as a drag on social progress. But these rather general statements are followed by propositions which are in crying contradiction with the aims proclaimed earlier.

The German Social-Democrats say: "Private property in the means of production has the right to expect protection and support in so far as it does not prevent the establishment of a fair social system."*** The same idea is contained in the Policy Programme of the Dutch Party of Labour, which says: "In order to promote efficiency and to bring about a more widespread distribution of economic power, it is desirable for different forms of publicly owned and privately owned enterprises to exist side by side. Within such a structure, however, public control must be exercised over privately owned undertakings in so far as this proves to be necessary in the interests of the community."**** The Austrian Socialists, while not daring to spell out this kind of clause in their programme, nevertheless say that the establishment of a better functioning economic system implies "that the initiative of the entrepreneurs, competition and the mechanism of price formation are given full scope for development within the framework of an economy catering exclusively for the interests of society".*****

We find, therefore, that the Social-Democratic programmes do not connect the establishment of a "fair social system" with abolition of private capitalist property and its

* *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, May 15, 1958.

** *Socialist International Information*, No. 9, 1960, p. 137.

*** *Uorwärts*, November 20, 1959.

**** *Socialist International Information*, No. 9, 1960, p. 137.

***** *Arbeiter-Zeitung*, May 15, 1958.

supplanting by socialist property owned by the whole people.

This fair social system—socialism—and private property in the means of production are incompatible, because it is private property that produces the exploitation of labour by capital and results in social inequality. This is axiomatic. That is why it is safe to say that the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders have slid down to acting as apologists for capitalism and misleading the working class.

Socio-economic processes in the industrialised capitalist countries, the Social-Democratic ideologists say, have resulted in a change of content in three principal conceptions: state, class and revolution. Pietro Nenni, for instance, says that in the West the state is "no longer an expression of the dictatorship and monopoly of one class, or even of the economically strongest", but is a "social equilibrium or disequilibrium" between many classes. "The conception of class has extended to all the forces of labour; workers, peasants, technicians, and the intelligentsia". Finally, the "conception of revolution no longer springs from violence, civil war, or class and party dictatorship, but has been extended into a conception of society's democratic evolution which is on its way to ever higher, equality-creating forms of social life".* Herbert Wehner, a West German Right-wing Social-Democratic leader, is even more explicit. He says the "merits" of the Bad-Godesberg programme lie above all in the fact that it has done with the idea that the Social-Democratic Party and its policy are "an expression of historical development and the struggle of classes", and that socialisation of the means of production is "the means and the aim of the Social-Democratic economic policy".**

Current tendencies in the development of state-monopoly capitalism, including the limited nationalisation put through by the ruling circles of some countries, are being used by the Right-wing Social-Democrats in an effort to justify their reformist theoretical views and political line, which deny the need for resolute working-class intervention in society's economic, social and political life for the purpose of its radical revolutionary transformation.

Social-Democratic programmes present socialism not as

* Pietro Nenni, "Die Strategie des Sozialismus", *Die Zukunft*, No. 8-9, 1966, p. 21.

** Günter Gaus, *Staatserhaltende Opposition oder hat die SPD kapituliert? Gespräche mit Herbert Wehner*, Hamburg, 1966, p. 38.

a qualitatively new socio-economic formation, but as an improved version of existing, that is capitalist, society. That is why the class struggle is denied and the dictatorship of the proletariat anathematised. Elections and parliamentary and government activity are the main instruments, say the "democratic socialists", who declare extra-parliamentary forms of struggle to be "anti-democratic".

The political and ideological propositions which the Right-wing Social-Democrats have managed to smuggle into the new programmes prevent the solution of problems confronting the whole working class, as state monopoly tendencies and the scientific and technological revolution continue to develop. These theoretical propositions cannot be used as a basis for producing any real alternative to the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie, which seeks to start a drive against the positions won by the working people in persistent class struggle.

It is not surprising, therefore, that there is more and more expression of uncertainty and anxiety within the ranks of the Social-Democratic movement itself. Whereas the Right-wing Socialist leaders, guided by their doctrine of "democratic socialism," have finally abandoned any demand that would cut at the roots of monopoly bourgeois domination, a sizable section of the Social-Democratic Party membership takes a different view. Many rank-and-file Social-Democrats have sharply criticised the Right-opportunist "reform of reformism" carried out by their leaders. A characteristic admission comes from Willy Brandt, Chairman of the SDPG, which he made at his party's Nuremberg Congress in March 1968. He said: "I am afraid that many today do not accept as impelling or inspiring the ideas of democratic socialism as we have reformulated them in the Bad-Godesberg programme."* He went on to make a statement which was a virtual admission of the ideological and theoretical bankruptcy of "democratic socialism". He declared that Social-Democracy did not have a "clear-cut socio-political conception", that it did not indicate "ways into a good future", and that it did not say "with sufficient conviction what the masses must expect of us ... as a Party".**

* *Parteitag der Sozialdemokratischen Partei Deutschlands vom 17. bis 21. März 1968 in Nürnberg. Hrsg. Vorstand der SPD, Bonn, 1968, p. 82.*

** *Ibid.*, p. 83.

There is no doubt at all that this awareness of ideological crisis reasserts with fresh force the question before the Social-Democratic masses of whether their leaders were right to repudiate the doctrine which had once been the ideological banner of Social-Democracy.

The ideological and political turn to the right, expressed in the new party programmes, could not and did not result in mitigation of the crisis in the Social-Democratic movement. On the contrary, the struggle between its two opposite tendencies has grown more acute. It continues to permeate the whole of the domestic and foreign policy of the Social-Democratic Parties.

The struggle between the two tendencies in the Social-Democratic movement assumes a variety of form. It is expressed, in particular, in the rising criticism of the policies pursued by the Right-wing Social-Democratic leaders on the part of a large section of Social-Democratic trade union members, a development which deserves the closest attention because the trade unions are the most massive working-class organisations, and in many developed capitalist countries constitute the mass basis of the Social-Democratic Parties.

Thus, in recent years serious differences have come to light between the West German Social-Democratic leaders and the German Federation of Trade Unions not only over the adoption of the "emergency laws", but also over greater trade union participation in managing the economy, and other pressing problems.

In the recent period there has been a sharp increase of trade union discontent with the Labour Government's policy in Britain. When they voted for the Labour Party in the parliamentary election of March 1966, the working people had expected the Wilson Government, in with a sound majority, to start pursuing a socio-economic policy in line with the people's interests. However, that did not happen. Having consolidated its positions in the House of Commons, the Labour government started a direct drive on the living standards of the working people. In August 1966, it rushed through Parliament a prices and incomes law providing for a total freeze on wages, and authorising government bodies to institute legal proceedings against workers going on strike or even urging strikes for higher pay. In other words, there has been a substantial reduction in trade union rights.

The British working people's discontent with the government's policy resulted in the fact, among other things, that by the time of the annual Labour Party Conference at Blackpool in 1968 the number of individual members had dropped to the lowest level after 1949—734,000 (not counting the collective members, which means most of the trade unions).

Most speakers at the Blackpool Conference voiced alarm over the future of the Labour movement, in view not only of the dwindling membership in the local party branches, but also of a decline in confidence among voters, which was evident in the serious defeats suffered by the Labour candidates at the parliamentary by-elections and local council elections even in traditional Labour Party strongholds.

Things came to such a pass that shortly before the conference opened calls were issued at the sittings of some trade union executives to withhold payment of membership dues to the Labour Party (whose main source of funds are the trade union dues).

Let us recall that in 1967 a Labour Party conference passed a resolution demanding that the government should keep aloof from the US war in Vietnam. At the 1968 conference, the government's economic policy was rejected by an overwhelming majority.

In 1968, for the first time in the history of Labour conferences, the party leadership was opposed by the leaders of the major trade unions, with especially sharp criticism of the government's policies coming from Hugh Scanlon, Chairman of the Amalgamated Engineering and Foundry Workers' Union, the second largest union, and a member of Parliament, and Trevor Park, a leader of the Transport and General Workers' Union, the largest in Britain.

A new situation is taking shape in the Labour Party. At one time, the Labour leadership used the unions as an instrument in suppressing opposition from the county branches, but at the 1968 conference the Party leaders were first confronted with a bloc of the major trade unions acting in a united front against the government's economic policy and on various other issues.

The publication in the summer of 1968 by the Leftist Labourites of the *Socialist Charter* reflected the growing and massive discontent. It says in part: "No better example could be set before us than the Chartists of the last century.

They asserted the right of working people to control their own lives.... The Chartists' demands were not wrong—but they were inadequate. The central principle of a Socialist Charter of our time must be that those who take decisions affecting the welfare and happiness of the people must be made accountable to the people.”*

One of the main demands of the Charter is “full public accountability of private and public institutions and growing democratic control by workers and employees over the decisions which determine their working lines”.**

These developments show that there is a growing struggle against the Right-wing leaders' line within the Social-Democratic movement.

* * *

At the present stage of the struggle against the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie it is extremely important to secure the unity of the whole working class.

Marxism-Leninism teaches and historical practice confirms that cohesion and unity of its ranks is a necessary condition for the victory of the working class. Lenin emphasised: “Unless the working class is united its struggle cannot be successful.”*** The exceptional danger of a split and the vital necessity for the unity of the working class were expressed by Lenin in these two sentences: “Disunited, the workers are nothing. United, they are everything.”****

A real way of uniting the workers' action in the developed capitalist countries is co-operation between the Communist and the Social-Democratic (Socialist) Parties, which represent the two main political trends within the international working-class movement. Considering that most workers and a large section of the other working people in the developed capitalist countries in one form or another support the Communists and the Social-Democratic Parties, it stands to reason that not only further success in the mass struggle against the monopolies but also consolidation of the positions already won depends above all on joint action by the Communists and the Social-Democrats.

Let us recall that the Right-wing Social-Democrats fre-

* *Tribune*, June 7, 1968.

** *Ibid.*

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 19, p. 112.

**** *Ibid.*, p. 519.

quently accuse the Communists of dogmatism and sectarianism. This draws attention to a highly curious situation which has taken shape over the last decade. The Social-Democrats, who pride themselves on a high sense of "reality" and fundamental "anti-dogmatism", in practice are quite unable in most instances to abandon the outdated views adopted fifty years ago. It is not the Social-Democrats but the Communists that have displayed true realism and have risen to meet the demands of the present day by taking the initiative in working for joint action by the working class. This initiative is based on two fundamental propositions.

First, the Communists regard the Socialist Parties as Workers' Parties, with whom they want to co-operate "both in the struggle to improve the working people's living conditions, to extend and preserve their democratic rights, to win and safeguard national independence and peace among nations, and in the struggle to win power and build socialism".*

In the recent period, the ruling cliques in the state-monopoly capitalist countries have clearly revealed an urge to deprive bourgeois-democratic institutions of any real meaning; the monopoly bourgeoisie has been carrying on an open drive against the working people's political, economic and social gains. At the same time, the economic and political forms of the class struggle are being intertwined, and the struggle for democracy is being carried closer to the struggle for socialism. In these conditions, the Social-Democratic Parties could make a very important contribution to realising the democratic alternative to the dictatorship of the monopoly bourgeoisie.

Second, the experience of the working-class movement has been confirmed over and over again: the working class scores its greater successes in the fight against the bourgeoisie when the Communists and the Social-Democrats act in some form of united front, and on the contrary, the bourgeoisie has inflicted the most serious defeats on the working class whenever the Communists and the Social-Democrats have been alienated or openly hostile.

Co-operation between the Communist and the Socialist Parties meets the interests of the working-class struggle for

* *The Struggle for Peace, Democracy and Socialism*, pp. 72-73.

peace, democracy and socialism, and is a most important condition ensuring success in this struggle.

At present, there are considerably better conditions and possibilities for attaining joint action by the Communist and the Socialist Parties. The radical change in the world balance of forces in favour of socialism allows a new approach to many important issues which were a source of discord between Communists and Socialists in the past. The policy of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems has produced a real possibility of excluding world war from the life of human society even before socialism finally triumphs throughout the world. All true champions of peace, whether Communists or Social-Democrats, want to prevent war. This opens up the way to their co-operation in order to preserve peace.

In the new conditions, some capitalist countries may well move on to socialism without armed uprising. In putting forward the thesis of such a transition to socialism, the Communists explode the old lie that they are diehard advocates of an armed take-over of power (or civil war) whatever the conditions. At the same time, the Communists have shown in practice the full importance of the sound political bloc consisting of the working class and all social sections desirous of a victory for democracy and socialism, and the decisive part co-operation between the Communists and the Social-Democrats has to play in establishing such a bloc.

Co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists is promoted by the struggle of the working class for democracy and the struggle for socialism in the advanced capitalist countries moving closer to each other. The objective basis for joint action by all working-class parties is extended by defence of democratic constitutions and the prerogatives of parliament, the struggle for broader democratic freedoms, a curb on the power of the monopolies and democratic control over the economic functions of the state, and for workers' participation in running enterprises, concerns and the economy as a whole.

Furthermore, co-operation between these parties is promoted by the exposure of the anti-communist inventions of bourgeois propaganda. The Soviet Union's peaceable policy has exploded the slanderous myth of the "aggressiveness" of socialism. The economic, scientific and technical achieve-

ments of the Soviet Union and other socialist countries also refute anti-communist assertions that socialism is incapable of tackling the problems arising from construction of the new economy. As its economy and culture develop, the democratic principles of state and social life improve, and the people's welfare increases, socialism becomes ever more attractive for the working people of the capitalist countries.

Another group of factors now favouring co-operation between the Communists and the Socialists spring from the processes going forward in the Social-Democratic movement described above. They may be summed up in these two conclusions. First, there is mounting pressure by the Social-Democratic masses to have their leaders review their foreign policy conceptions in the sense of working out a peaceable foreign policy. Second, there is growing awareness in the Social-Democratic movement that the reforms carried out in some advanced capitalist countries since the war are quite limited.

Life itself has shown millions of workers that the reformist way fails to eliminate the rule of the monopolies and consequently to do away with the constant threat to the economic and social gains of the working class, or to remove the exploitation of the working people. There is growing demand among Socialist working people for a struggle for deep-going democratic change undermining the basis of monopoly rule and opening the way to socialism, and this has forced some Right-wing Socialist leaders to manoeuvre.

These demands are reflected, for instance, in this statement by Guy Mollet, one-time General Secretary of the French Socialist Party: "In all the countries where the Social-Democrats have found themselves at the head of the state—sometimes for many years—they have failed to change the character of the economic system.

"The Scandinavian countries are the best and the most obvious example. I think that our comrades have extracted from capitalist society everything that can be extracted from it through reform. We are coming to a point when we must display boldness, execute a leap and make an attempt on the capitalist system itself. In other words, start a real revolutionary process."^{*}

^{*} *Le Nouvel Observateur*, No. 207, October 28-November 3, 1968, p. 24.

Of course, the admission that the Social-Democratic movement has no prospects under a "class peace" is a far cry from a resolute drive against the positions of monopoly capital, and such statements are largely made for tactical reasons. But only five or ten years ago such statements were inconceivable, and are an indication of the growing pressure from the rank-and-file members with whom the Social-Democratic leaders must reckon.

The international working-class movement has acquired considerable experience in joint action by Communists and Social-Democrats, and in their effort to achieve such unity the Communists act on principles tested in practice.

In their policy with respect to the Socialist Parties, the Communists are guided solely by the interests of the working class, and regard Socialist workers as their brothers by class. That is why the Communists bring out what unites them and the Socialists in the fight against the common enemy—monopoly capital.

In order to achieve unity of action by the working people the Communists are prepared to make and have made various compromises and concessions—provided these do not affect the fundamental ideological or political principles of Marxism-Leninism. They are guided by Lenin's ideas that "to reject compromises 'on principle,' to reject the permissibility of compromises in general, no matter of what kind, is childishness, which it is difficult even to consider seriously".* The Communist Parties support every step, however small, by the Social-Democrats and their organizations to meet them half way, where this helps to unite the proletariat. In working for joint action in the struggle for some specific aim meeting the interests of the working people, the Communists never put forward any terms except those which immediately promote the attainment of this aim, and that in itself serves as a starting point for carrying forward their joint action.

Take the demand for democratic control over investment, credit and prices, which the Social-Democratic leaders consider a self-contained factor and a means of building socialist society. The Communists, for their part, regard such measures primarily as an effective means of putting limits on the power of monopoly capital, and helping the working

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 37.

class to see the need for a struggle to transform society on truly socialist principles. But the different approach to these measures and their different interpretation cannot be an obstacle to joint action by Communists and Social-Democrats to put these measures through.

Historical experience shows that the split within the working-class movement cannot be overcome all at once, overnight, through some single tactical formula. The way to unity is labyrinthine and can be covered only gradually, step by step, developing and extending contacts between the parties and other workers' organisations, and going on from the most elementary and most easily achieved forms of unity to ever sounder and more comprehensive ones.

The errors of the past have been overcome, and the problem of unity is no longer being one-sidedly reduced either to the establishment of contacts with rank-and-file Socialists in defiance of the party leadership or, on the contrary, to formal agreements at the top.

The Communist Parties attach primary importance to the development of joint action with the mass of members and supporters of the Socialist Parties, being aware that it is altogether impossible to attain any kind of lasting unity unless the mutual mistrust and estrangement to be found here and there locally (above all in the trade unions and the enterprises) are overcome. Concentrating their efforts on this, the Communists are not at all inclined to ignore the fact that the Social-Democratic and Socialist Parties exist as independent organisations or to show neglect of their governing bodies.

Correct policies in the struggle for unity at various levels of the working-class movement have helped the Communist Parties to achieve some success in bringing closer together the positions of the main political contingents of the working class in a number of West European countries.

As the events of 1968 and 1969 showed, the question of unity of all democratic forces in France is an especially acute one. The Communist Party has been consistently and steadily pursuing its policy of seeking unity of action with the Socialists.

Following the parliamentary election in March 1967, the FCP invited the Federation of Left Democrats and Socialists (FLDS), of which the Socialist Party was the main part, to start framing a common programme. In February 1968,

the FCP and the FLDS issued a statement confirming that they opposed the regime of personal power "in any form" and that they had reached agreement on the need to wage a joint struggle against this regime, all the way to its removal and establishment of a genuine democracy.

The statement formulated concrete proposals for developing the economy, increasing the purchasing power of the masses, raising wages, pensions and aids, ensuring full employment, improving the social security system, and the system of general education and occupational training, developing research, agriculture and housing construction, and various other social measures. There was, consequently, a broad base for joint action, a fact of tremendous importance.

They failed to overcome their differences on foreign policy issues (attitude to NATO, European integration, the situation in the Middle East, and so on). Let us note, however, that even in this sphere there are signs of fresh possibilities for a rapprochement. Both sides, for instance, came out in favour of abandoning the French "force de frappe", of France's signing the Moscow Treaty banning nuclear weapons tests in three environments, arms reduction, non-proliferation of atomic weapons, establishment of non-nuclear zones in Europe, and a European collective security system whose main point would be recognition of the "peace border" along the Oder-Neisse line.

Over the US aggression in Vietnam the sides reached agreement on the following three points: the need for an immediate and unconditional halt to the US bombing of North Vietnam; an early political settlement of the conflict through the application in those conditions of the principles of the Geneva Agreements, providing in particular for the Vietnamese people's right to decide their own future; and French recognition of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Both sides condemned the fascist regimes in Spain, Portugal and Greece, and reaffirmed their determination to continue joint action with the peoples of these countries.

They stated that the Common Market, which has become a real fact of international life, was being ruled by cartels, trusts and international groups of political dealers. They considered it necessary to give the Common Market a new and profoundly different economic and social content that would meet the interests of the working people, and to ensure participation in its agencies of trade unions, work-

ers' and farmers' organisations, and all political parties without exception which are represented in the national parliaments, giving all these representatives full rights.

On the whole, the agreement opened up new and much wider prospects for joint action by Communists and Socialists.

However, during the May-June 1968 events, the workers' solidarity was damaged not only by provocative action. The behaviour of some FLDS leaders at critical moments did nothing to make the cohesion of the Left forces any stronger.

At its December 1968 plenary meeting, the FCP Central Committee issued the Manifesto, "For an Advanced Democracy, for a Socialist France!", giving a profound analysis of the May-June events, assessing the consequent changes in the country and indicating the way for the working people's struggle for a socialist France. The way to the triumph of socialism, said the Manifesto, ran through the establishment of a progressive democracy which could arise only as a result of cohesive and comprehensive struggle by the people. It would be easier to achieve this if all democratic and workers' organisations came together for joint struggle on the basis of a political programme, the first step in realising which were the agreements between the FCP and the FLDS concluded before the May 1968 events. General Secretary of the FCP Waldeck Rochet told the plenary meeting that there was need for co-operation between the Communist Party and other political organisations representing the working people's interests, notably, the Socialist Party of France.*

Following General de Gaulle's resignation in May 1969, there arose a favourable possibility for further concerted action by the Workers' Parties in the struggle for democracy and a socialist France. One important step in that direction could have been the nomination of a common presidential candidate by all the democratic forces, as the FCP proposed. However, ignoring the basic interests of the working class, the Socialist Party leadership refused to co-operate with the Communists, and this made it much harder to achieve joint action by the working people in that period.

* *Pravda*, December 8, 1968.

In Japan, the 30th Congress of the Socialist Party, which took a definite turn towards co-operation with the Communists, was of great importance in achieving united working-class action. In 1965, the Socialist Party had been willing to take joint action with the Communist Party of Japan only in the struggle against the US aggression in Vietnam, but today the sphere of their joint activity is somewhat more extensive. In 1967 and 1968, this was expressed, in particular, in the two Parties' acting in a united front and securing the election of their democratic candidates to the office of mayor of Tokyo and head of the administration of the Ryukyu Islands (which include the US-occupied island of Okinawa).

The 31st Congress of the Socialist Party of Japan in September 1968 by and large reaffirmed the Party's political line. It rejected the anti-Soviet resolutions motioned by the ultra-Left elements.

The Communist Party of Finland has taken a consistent stand for united working-class action. The appeal of its Central Committee issued in 1954 on the question of unity said that the Party was prepared to co-operate with the Social-Democratic Party on a policy meeting the people's interests, and this was met with broad sympathy by the working class. Many trade unions came out in favour of their co-operation. However, the Social-Democratic Party's leadership did not support the Communists' initiative. What is more, over the next few years, there was a marked increase among its leadership of anti-communist and anti-Soviet attitudes. When in 1958 the Workers' Parties won a majority of the seats in parliament, the SDPF flatly refused to co-operate with the Communists on a government level. On the eve of the 1962 presidential election, the Right-wing leaders of the SDPF set up a bloc designed to return an extreme Right-wing candidate who opposed friendly relations with the Soviet Union. However, this scheme fell through. The anti-communist moves by the SDPF leader V. Tanner and his supporters resulted in a heavy defeat for the Social-Democrats at the polls.

This caused grave anxiety in the Party ranks. Changes were made in the SDPF leadership at its congress in 1963, and a new chairman was elected. There were signs of change in the SDPF's political line: anti-monopoly demands were intensified, and the Party was gradually beginning to

recognise the need to strengthen friendly relations between Finland and the USSR.

The March 1966 parliamentary elections, at which the Left-wing forces scored a major victory, served as a further impetus in realising the idea of co-operation of all working-class parties. The seats in parliament were distributed as follows: the Left-wing forces, 103 out of 200; Social-Democrats, 55; Democratic Union of the People of Finland, of which the Communist Party is the mainstay, 41; and the Social-Democratic Workers' and Smallholders' Union, 7. Together with the Centre Party, headed by President Kekkonen, the new government includes representatives of all the working-class parties—the Social-Democrats, the Communists and the Social-Democratic Workers' and Smallholders' Union. This made Finland the first country in Western Europe to have all the Left forces resuming co-operation on a government level since the end of the 1940s.

In spite of some serious difficulties, the Communist Party of Finland has been putting in a great effort further to strengthen co-operation between the Social-Democrats and the Communists, especially in mass working people's organisations, the trade unions, above all.

Anti-communist elements are active in the SDPF itself, seeking to find allies in bourgeois political circles and continuing their attempts to disrupt the co-operation between the Social-Democrats and the Communists. These Rightist elements regard joint action by the working-class parties as a temporary expedient, and seek to use it to promote their narrow party interests, being prepared at any time to have the SDPF resume co-operation with the bourgeois parties, including the extreme Right.

However, there is also a Left-wing trend in the SDPF which supports the government's present policy and favours continuation of the present government coalition and co-operation with the Communists. It should be emphasised that this trend has the support of the workers, the young people and the intelligentsia. Some of its statements contain propositions declaring the possibility and need for socialist change in the country.

In the recent period, co-operation between the Communists and the Social-Democrats has continued to make headway, but, as a resolution of the CPF Central Committee

plenary meeting in April 1968 said, co-operation between the CPF and the SDPF "has yet to become as extensive and fruitful as the common interests of the workers demand, and has yet to become a programme co-operation for tackling the most important problems facing the country".*

In Italy, a pact on joint action by the Communist and the Socialist Parties was in effect from 1934 to 1956, and this was one of the most important factors behind the high combat ability of the Italian working class, and a source of its strength and influence on the country's political development. However, in 1956 the ISP leaders repudiated the alliance with the ICP and decided on political co-operation with the Christian-Democratic Party (CDP), the chief party of monopoly capital. It is true that through the efforts of the Communists and the ISP's Left wing co-operation between the two Parties was preserved in the country's largest trade union association—the General Italian Confederation of Labour—which enabled the Italian working people to achieve substantial success in their strike struggle and in their trade union activity as a whole.

At the same time, the ISP leaders' unwillingness to join the CDP leaders in the government enabled Italy's ruling circles to stage the so-called Centre-Left experiment, designed to divide the Left forces, deepen the split within the working class, and isolate the Communist Party.

A further shift in the ISP political line to the right was expressed in a decision by the ISP Congress in November 1965 to unite with the Social-Democratic Party (ISDP), which is pursuing a patently Rightist, anti-communist policy.

On the ISP-ISDP alignment all the progressive forces in the country adopted a clear-cut attitude of criticism and condemnation, first, because it was a step not towards unity of the working-class and socialist forces, but towards a deepening and extension of the differences already existing among the working people and democratic masses in Italy, and involved repudiation of all contacts and co-operation with the Communist Party and the other Left-wing forces of the Italian working-class and socialist movement; second, because the alignment rested on Social-Democratic ideological and political principles, and signified the Socialists'

* *Kommunisti*, No. 4, 1968, p. 205.

repudiation of their best traditions of class and socialist struggle.

That the view of this ISP-ISDP alignment as a splitting action was correct has been subsequently fully borne out by political developments in Italy, in particular, by the results of the parliamentary elections in May 1968. Defeat at the polls and deepening of the inner-Party crisis were the price the United Socialist Party (USP) paid for the participation by some of its leaders in the anti-democratic Centre-Left government, for their meek acceptance of the Atlantic policy and refusal to act together with the Communists and other Left forces in the working-class movement. In the elections to the Chamber of Deputies, the USP lost more than one million votes as compared with the 1963 elections.

Let us note that the USP lost the bulk of the votes in the industrial areas, which means that the working class had condemned the splitting line pursued by Nenni and his followers. At the same time, it is in these workers' areas that the Italian Communist Party and the Italian Socialist Party of Proletarian Unity (ISPPU), i.e., the parties favouring joint workers' action, won most of their votes. The ICP polled almost 788,000 votes more across the country than in 1963, and increased its total vote to 8,550,000. The ISPPU, taking part in the election for the first time (it had been set up only in 1964, when the Left wing withdrew from the ISP), established itself in the political arena by polling almost 1,500,000.

The newspaper *La Stampa*, mouthpiece of FIAT, Italy's biggest monopoly, voicing apprehension over the further massive shift to the left, summed up the results of the election in these words: "Every third Italian is either a Communist or a Proletarian Socialist. Tomorrow the numbers might be greater, and the Socialist Party (Nenni's) may find itself seriously weakened. . . ."*

The internal crisis in the USP was further deepened by the defeat at the polls. It developed five trends, each with its own platform on the main political issues. The trend led by Lombardi, which is farthest out on the Left, has come out for joint action with the Communists.

The Rightist leadership has been seriously alarmed by the centrifugal tendencies in the party, and mounted a series

* *World Marxist Review*, No. 7, July 1968, p. 47.

of attempts to put their house in order and to drown out the voices of the opposition by any means. They pinned their greatest hopes on the congress in October 1968, but it clearly failed to justify these hopes and merely revealed unprecedented confusion among the delegates. Things came to such a pass that they found it impossible even to motion the most important resolutions. Virtually, their only "achievement" was to rename the party as the Italian Socialist Party—Italian Section of the Socialist International (ISP-ISSI).

The ISP-ISSI managed to galvanise the Centre-Left government by surrendering more of its positions to the Right wing of the CDP and deepening the crisis in its own ranks.

However, the Right-wing leadership did not manage to use the breathing space in order to consolidate its unprincipled and opportunist line and to overcome the opposition groupings, each of which demanded, with varying consistency, a review of the Party's domestic and foreign policy line. These demands were stubbornly resisted by the Rightists, who were intent on preventing any change whatsoever.

The polarisation of forces among the Socialists resulted in the establishment, in early July 1969, of a new association by the Right-wing trends, the so-called Unitary Socialist Party, whose platform differs in no real sense from the ideological credo of the old ISDP, and which has even adopted the old Social-Democratic emblem—the rising sun. The United Socialist Party has now disintegrated, virtually into the same bits and pieces that were artificially cobbled together in 1965.

The ISP-ISSI's short-lived and inglorious existence was a visual demonstration of the Right-wing leadership's futile attempts to scrap the fine record of joint struggle by Communists and Socialists for a democratic renewal of the social and political structures of Italian society.

* * *

The experience of the working-class movement in the capitalist countries shows that there is a differentiation in the ranks of the Social-Democrats: some of its leaders have essentially taken up defence of imperialism, while others are inclined to show some consideration for the working people's demands. In the Social-Democratic Parties, whose leaders opt for co-operation with the parties of the monopoly

bourgeoisie, there is growing discontent and ferment, and Left-wing trends are being formed, some of which branch out as independent parties seeking unity of action with the Communist Parties in one form or another. Consequently, estrangement with the Communists and collaboration with the bourgeois circles ultimately lead to a weakening and degeneration of Social-Democracy.

The Communist and Workers' Parties declared at their 1969 forum that resolute criticism of opportunism remained their invariable task. The crisis of reformist conceptions was increasing, so that in the present situation there was an even more obvious need for struggle to achieve working-class unity, and for both sides to display good will and a constructive approach to the attainment of joint action. The possibility of taking such an approach sprang from the points of the programmes formulating common goals, and from the fact that the Communist and the Social-Democratic Parties operated in many identical spheres bearing on the vital interests of the working class. Active joint struggle by Communists and Social-Democrats to realise these interests could considerably advance the cause of working-class unity.

The struggle for joint action by the working class calls for great efforts, and does not run a smooth course, without temporary setbacks and reverses. Joint action by Communists and Social-Democrats has already produced some successes for the working class in a number of countries. However, on the whole, it is too slow in developing and not as broad as life demands. To enhance and strengthen working-class unity there is need for efforts both by the Communist and the Social-Democratic Parties. "The Communists, who attribute decisive importance to working-class unity, are in favour of co-operation with the Socialists and Social-Democrats to establish an advanced democratic regime today and to build a socialist society in the future. They will do everything they can to carry out this co-operation.... To advance on this path it is, of course, necessary for the Socialist Parties and other political organisations favouring socialism resolutely to break with the policy of class collaboration with the bourgeoisie and to pursue a policy of effective struggle for peace, democracy and socialism."^{*}

^{*} *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow, 1969, pp. 24-25.*

AGAINST MINIMISING
THE HISTORICAL MISSION
OF THE WORKING CLASS

The mounting social dynamism of the present epoch, the growing proportions of the world-wide revolutionary liberation process, and the involvement in it of ever broader sections of the population, including non-proletarian sections, confront the Marxists-Leninists with a number of new political and ideological problems. Life demands that they should combine flexibility with principled approach. The Communist movement, taking care not to seclude itself within its own framework, is purposefully working throughout the world to consolidate the working-class alliance with millions of peasants, urban middle sections, and the intelligentsia so as to strengthen the world anti-imperialist front.

At the same time, the Communists constantly bear in mind Lenin's warning that "the enlistment of larger and larger numbers of new 'recruits', the attraction of new sections of the working people must inevitably be accompanied by waverings in the sphere of theory and tactics, by repetitions of old mistakes, by a temporary reversion to antiquated views and antiquated methods".*

Lenin's conclusion is borne out by the development of the present-day world revolutionary movement. The scale of the international progressive, anti-imperialist movement has been increasing. Diverse social sections are joining in the struggle against reaction, for peace, democracy and socialism. The new sections joining in the general revolutionary tide frequently lack political experience and ties with the Marxist-Leninist vanguard of the international working class, and this explains their immature, spontaneous action. All this creates a basis for the adoption, especially by some young people, of anarchist and various extremist views.

Objectively, these views are sometimes close to or on a number of points quite identical with the views propounded by some reformist "critics" of Leninism, "Left"-wing bourgeois apologists of the "third way", ideologists of peasant "socialism" (like Frantz Fanon) or theorists of present-day technocracy (like Pierre Moussa), who give a distorted read-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 16, p. 348.

ing to the main class contradictions of our epoch.* In one form or another they all attack the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of the working class's leading role in the struggle for social progress.

For some time now socio-"critical" and socio-utopian doctrines have been gaining ground in the capitalist West, especially among the "new Left" intelligentsia and a section of the rebellious student youth. In this connection, Marxists-Leninists in various countries have justly stressed that the Communists have to intensify their reasoned criticism of the theories propounded by Herbert Marcuse and other modern "Left" bourgeois ideologists.** This point was also made by prominent leaders of the revolutionary working-class movement at the 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties.

One of the main tasks of the ideological work by the Marxist-Leninist Parties at the present stage is to expose the roots and scientific groundlessness of such doctrines, which debase the historical mission of the working class and spread various ideas about the proletariat's integration with the modern capitalist system, and to analyse the reasons for their revival and influence on some social sections abroad.

As the complex and intensive revolutionary processes tend to change the face of the modern world, and as diverse social anti-monopoly movements of the working people take shape in the capitalist countries (the May-June 1968 events in France are a case in point), more and more people are involved in the fight to abolish the system of man's exploitation and oppression, in vigorous social action and political life. At the same time, account must be taken of the changes in the social structure of the population in the capitalist countries today. The growth of the wage-labour army is a painful and contradictory process, and entails the formation of various intermediate social categories and groups and emergence of declassed sections of the population. This goes to create conditions for resurgence of the traditional and

* A critique of typical conceptions of this kind has already been made in earlier publications by the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences, like the chapter in the monograph *The Great October Revolution and the World Revolutionary Process (Fifty Years of Struggle by the Working Class at the Head of the Revolutionary Forces of the Modern Epoch)*, Russ. ed., Politizdat, Moscow, 1967, pp. 403-54.

** *World Marxist Review*, No. 8, 1969, pp. 42-46.

appearance of new forms of petty-bourgeois and lumpen-bourgeois radicalism and semi-proletarian and pseudo-revolutionary ideologies, many of which bear the characteristic stamp of *utopian* thinking.

In the theoretical sphere proper, this reveals itself most clearly through all sorts of socio-critical conceptions, immature forms of opposition, burdened with anarchist illusions about state-monopoly capitalism. Events in the past few years in some imperialist countries (USA, FRG, France, Italy and Japan, especially) show that these conceptions have a definite part to play in the mass movement, where they figure as relatively coherent social doctrines adopted by new categories of working people who have yet to realise their real place within the system of capitalist exploitation, and their objective kinship with the working class.

Such ideas seem humanistic to people who feel that they are mere cogs in the bureaucratic machinery of state-monopoly capitalism and who keenly feel the danger of social disaster (like war) and the threat of fascism and militarism, if only because they frequently see these ideas as a record of their own spontaneous feelings raised to the level of general social protest, including their own dissatisfaction with a given situation and a sense of crisis in the society they live in.

The views of the world appearing as ideological opposition to the existing order and current in the USA and Western Europe are highly diverse, differing from each other in ideological, political or methodological terms and enjoying a varied popularity. Some are accepted mainly in academic circles, others among those who take a direct part in social movements.

* * *

A typical specimen of the second type of critical theories in the recent period has been provided by Herbert Marcuse,* a social philosopher whose ideas are in one way or another

* Marcuse's main ideas are set out in his *One-Dimensional Man. Studies in the Ideology of Advanced Industrial Society* (New York, 1964), which has had many editions and has been translated into many languages; his article, "Socialist Humanism?" in the collection *Socialist Humanism* (New York, 1965), and, finally, in his report at the symposium on the Role of Karl Marx in the Development of Contemporary Scientific Thought, organised under the auspices of UNESCO (Paris, May 1968).

connected with the Left-radical, mainly youth and student, movements, above all in the USA, France and Germany. It is true that the depth and strength of this connection is frequently exaggerated, and the sensation-seeking bourgeois press is largely to blame, for it has set up Marcuse as a prophet and as virtually the only "inspirer" and "leader" of the modern intelligentsia in the capitalist countries. Incidentally, Marcuse himself has had to recognise as much when he said: "I feel a solidarity with the 'angry students' movement, but I am in no sense their herald. It is the press and public opinion that have invested me with this title and have turned me into a best seller.... I am afraid that very few students have actually read my books."^{*}

Marcuse does not in fact claim to be an active and *direct participant* in the struggle. *He considers himself a theorist producing an original revolutionary theoretical system, a philosopher discovering and formulating general methodological and logical principles of consistent revolutionary-critical thinking.* It is highly important in this connection to study the *actual socio-political results* that could be achieved by movements wishing to be guided by his constructions and programme, and seeking to realise them.

Marcuse's conception clearly reveals the contradiction between his critical, radical schemes and the ultimately uncritical content of the theory embodying them.

At first sight, Marcuse starts out to characterise the capitalist system with the most serious critical intentions. He believes that the most characteristic tendency in the USA today (Marcuse himself believes that his theory is the product of his observation of development in that country) is the emergence of a special social state which he has designated as "one-dimensional".

He says that what is decisive for the whole social climate in the USA and West European countries is a movement towards the establishment of a comprehensive, integrated system of interacting production, administrative and educational institutions, a system of universal, functional interaction between all the elements of the social structure. This technological, economic and administrative "totality" or "one dimension" creates a rigid system determining the life and the behaviour of the individual; there arises a power-

^{*} *L'Express*, September 23-29, 1968, pp. 54-55.

ful, all-pervading apparatus conditioning the hearts and minds of men, and educating them in a spirit of "social conformism". The "standardised" rules and values designed to adapt members of society to the existing order are converted into the individual's "inner" dimensions. Thus, in strict accordance with the "one-dimensional society" there arises "one-dimensional man" with a "one-dimensional thought". This "one-dimensional" society is ruled by forces over which the individual has no control.

In the USA and Western Europe there is a progressive "enslavement of man by a productive apparatus", which tends to destroy the life of those who produce and use these instruments. "Technological rationality is geared to the requirements of the Cold War, which is waged not only (perhaps not even primarily) against the external enemy, but also against the enemy within the established societies—against a qualitatively new mode of existence which could free man from enslavement by the apparatus which he has built."^{*}

Consequently, the modern capitalist society, whose technological achievements and rising levels of consumption are recognised within the framework of these conceptions, is on the whole given a clearly *negative* assessment, mainly because its development tends to deform the will and abilities of the individual, and doom him to an unquestionable, even if veiled, bondage.

What makes Marcuse so different from many other liberal or reformist critics in the USA and Western Europe is his insistence, which is clear-cut and frequently impassioned, that capitalist society should and must be subjected to revolutionary destruction. However, our interest lies above all *not in Marcuse's personal sympathies and antipathies*, but *in the objective content* of the abstract constructions which he sets up as theory of society.

One important fact at once leaps to the eye: Marcuse's conception of "modern society" is most frequently identified with the conception of "advanced industrial society", *without the relation to the means of production*, property relations and the forms of property being included among the

^{*} *Socialist Humanism. An International Symposium*, ed. by E. Fromm, New York, 1965, p. 99.

fundamental characteristics of the modern social organisation. This suggests that Marcuse accepts as an article of faith the idea which is typical of all the schemes now coming under the head of "one industrial society". He also accepts the erroneous postulate, formulated within the framework of this theory, that there are no essential distinctions between modern capitalism and socialism.* Let us recall that the "one industrial society" theory has a definite function to perform in the present-day ideological struggle, which is to obscure in the minds of ordinary men the private property character of capitalist relations thoroughly exposed by Marx and Lenin.

Whenever Marcuse speaks of "capitalist" society he most frequently has in mind either a *geographical* instead of a social entity of concrete countries and states, or only the political-ideological and cultural-typological features of their organisation, instead of the *political-economic* foundations of the social system.

There is an obvious shift in Marcuse's conception: he blames industry and technical development for all the ills of modern society, and so falls victim to technological fetishism. He criticises the view taken by the founders of Marxism-Leninism of the ways and historical prospects for man's emancipation and the development of the full man as being "too optimistic and idealistic". He adds: "Marx underrated the extent of the conquest of nature and of man, of the technological management of freedom and self-realisation."** Marcuse casts doubt on the very possibility of realising the "humanist ideals" in the course of socialist transformation, for, in his opinion, this "is suppressed by the overwhelming power of technical progress welded into an instrument of totalitarian domination".*** That is why hopes for a better future should be pinned above all on a "total reconstruction of the technical apparatus" and "fundamental change in the direction of technical progress". Elsewhere he says that "no matter how 'technical' the basis of socialism has become, no matter how much it is a matter of the redirection and even reversal of technical progress", the tasks of the struggle for socialism "are political tasks, involving radical chan-

* See, for instance, Marcuse's interview to *Le Monde*, May 11, 1968.

** *Socialist Humanism*, p. 101.

*** *Ibid.*, p. 100.

ges in the society as a whole".* However, he does not explain in concrete terms what these radical changes of society as a whole, as a social system, should be.

He does not deny that socialism requires a high technological level, but he does not know—and frankly admits as much—in what way this development differs from the present-day processes usually designated as "scientific and technological revolution". However, of one thing he is sure and on it he insists: "As long as the established direction of technical progress prevails . . . *change in the ownership and control of the means of production* would be quantitative rather than qualitative change" (our italics—*Authors*).** Consequently, Marcuse discounts the problem of changing the socio-economic, production, class relations as being *secondary and not fundamental*; he says these relations have a minor role to play in the historical process and in the shaping of the objective logic of social development. Incidentally, many commentators and critics have remarked on this tendency in Marcuse's writings. For example, Lucio Coletti, Assistant Professor at Rome University, says: "In Marcuse's writings we find an indictment not of capitalism but of technology. . . . What he is fighting is the industrial society, industry itself, without class make-up."***

Marcuse treats as an absolute not only the role of technical progress in society's historical development, but also some of the intrinsic specific features of this process, above all the *rationality* of modern production organisation under capitalism.

The model of the "one-dimensional" society, which Marcuse simultaneously constructs and criticises, is one of a comprehensive *rationally regulated system* of functionally interconnected social institutions—production, economic, administrative and educational. In his description of the principal tendencies in US social organisation, he stresses that it is now shaping into a society with an intrinsically entrenched and irremovable "rationality" in governing things and men. It is true that at the same time he declares this society to be *irrational from the standpoint of the general ideals of humanism*: after all it has shown itself to be in-

* Ibid., p. 104.

** Ibid., p. 100.

*** *Corriere della sera*, June 1, 1968.

clined to wage aggressive wars and to suppress the human individual. Nevertheless, intrinsically, in its economic, administrative and ideological practices this society is moving towards realising the principles of rationality, co-ordination, regulation and control. He makes the groundless assertion that it is a "well-functioning, prosperous society"* from the standpoint of the tasks of its self-reproduction and realisation of the pragmatic aims formulated by the organs of power ruling it.**

He regards the social system of capitalism in the advanced countries as one which is capable of functioning without conflict and boundlessly improving itself merely in consequence of its "technological rationality". The result is that his theory is dominated by clearly idealised and utopian ideas about the advanced industrial-capitalist society, a "one-dimensional" view of the individual, who is typical of this society and who allegedly has a content or even "happy consciousness". Let us add that Marcuse views some of the actual features of the philistine, accommodating mind as *universal structures* of the mind of members of all social groups, comprising the majority of the working people and the exploited masses in the modern world. That is why Marcuse declares class peace to be the characteristic feature of this society.

He says modern capitalism is capable of maintaining continuity and stability, and "seems to be capable of containing social change". This society and state attain an unprecedented "unification of opposites",*** which includes the unity of all the main classes, among them the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, allegedly integrated into a "totality", and also the unprecedented unity of the individual member of the exploited class with the social and political whole.

Marcuse's model of the "one-dimensional" and "well-functioning" capitalist society, whose main attributes are "rationality", "unification of opposites" and "happy consciousness", is remarkably like the schemes, constructions and postulates of *apologetic* thinking. Identification of the conception of modern society with that of "industrial so-

* *Marx and Contemporary Scientific Thought*, The Hague-Paris, 1969, p. 488.

** *Mondo Nuovo*, May 26, 1968, p. 14.

*** Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*..., p. XII.

ciety" and denial of any qualitative distinctions between the capitalist and the socialist socio-historical formations are starting postulates both in the doctrine of Marcuse and of such well-known specialists in advertising the state-monopoly bureaucracy as Walt Rostow, Raymond Aron and others.

A characteristic tendency in the present-day forms of bureaucracy in the advanced capitalist countries is the *de-personification* of the connections between men and the establishment of an organisation alienated from the working man, who appears only as a tool for ensuring the interests of the monopolies and the bourgeois state: the workers and even a large section of engineering and technical personnel turn out to be a mere appendage to production processes (the functioning of a system of machines), and office workers of different grades, an appendage of administrative-financial processes and the administrative mechanism.

This tendency is only *outwardly* expressed as the result of the realisation of the general principles of rationality. But this is a special type of rationality, one that is confined to the framework of capitalism, a formal and partial rationality whose operation most frequently extends to the means and not to the main aims of developing production and all social organisation (these aims ultimately reflect the interests of ruling classes and cliques). But apologetic philosophy and the philistine mentality often identify this reproduction of dehumanised connections and processes in the sphere of the economy and administration with "technological rationality", an approach that tends to conceal the objective connections between the bureaucratic, dehumanised organisation and the type of "rationality" proper to it, on the one hand, and the nature of the *objective material relations*, and the character of the culture typical of the given society, on the other. But these are the very connections that the *Marxist-Leninist revolutionary scientific theory* brings out, emphasises and critically analyses.

In Volume III of *Capital*, Marx analysed these connections, and showed the intrinsic duality of the forms of control of socialised production under capitalism. He showed that there the organisation of control was subordinate not only to the objective requirements of rational industrial production, but also, and *this is especially important, to the class interests of the economically dominant social sections*, commanding things and men. The selection of alternatives in the process of admin-

istration, the choice of criteria of the effectiveness of administration depended on the system of dominant social relations and values, with the latter ultimately reflecting *the objective socio-class structure*, and the historically rooted type of culture of the given society. The scientific principles underlying the approach to real forms of organisation of production and administration, which arise under state-monopoly capitalism, were elaborated by Lenin. One need only recall Lenin's assessment of Taylorism. Lenin demanded that within this system of management a distinction should be made between the elements arising from a rational consideration of the specific and functional requirements in developing definite forms of modern production (large batch, mass production) and the elements *reflecting real class relations of domination and subordination*.

In the USA, bureaucratic ideology concentrates attention on man's "socialisation" as demanded by the functional requirements of the management machine, and on the properties and mechanisms of the human mind connected with man's capacity to adapt himself to a system of social roles, rules, standards, and disciplinary regulations set before him. The accent falls on the mechanisms of conformism, and the capacity of the mind to be directed and controlled. Main attention centres on the practice of manipulating man, so that the facts above all in the field of vision of the apologetic mind are those which testify to the relative successes of this practice.

Let us note that those in the USA who today are taking an *immediate* part in this process of "socialisation" are usually more realistically minded and not as optimistic: in contrast to bourgeois ideologists they normally declare that there is a massive latent and wide open protest among rank-and-file workers, and that this applies especially to the strike movement. The men actually performing the functions of manipulation, increasingly draw attention to the deeply buried charge of discontent, which for the time being lies concealed deep in the minds of rank-and-file workers by hand and by brain, a charge which may explode at any time and cause serious upheavals in the outwardly "stable" social system. The mass riots, and social protest movement which have become so characteristic of life today in the USA and the West European countries, in fact refute the optimistic utopia of the apologists of capitalism.

And so Marcuse, despite his "radical" critical aspirations, accepts the current apologetic notion that in that society, which is examined only in the light of modern technology, there is an all-embracing and all-powerful tendency towards conformism, and that the existing system of control in fact ensures a "total one-dimensional" state of the mind and "unification of opposites" between the antagonistic classes.

There is also a distortion of the contradictory social reality in the approach to the problem of consumption, and this is an important part of the "social critique" construction after Marcuse's model. The progress of modern industrial, large-batch, specialised production, combined with the class struggle of the proletariat, results in substantial changes in the level of consumption for rather broad masses of the population in the advanced capitalist countries. This does not mean, in any sense, that this ushers in an "epoch of universal welfare" as Rostow, Galbraith and others insist. One need only recall the generally known fact admitted by official statistics that mass pauperisation exists alongside patently parasitic forms of consumption by the governing élite.

State-monopoly organisation makes use of the sphere of consumption not only for artificially stimulating enterprise, but also to foster a massive "consumer" ideology and mentality, and shape a special type of individual, with standardised tastes and conformist consumer habits. This type of individual turns out to be a handy instrument for manipulating his thinking and behaviour by those who control the modern means of mass ideological influence, the mass media. It is generally known that there is widespread consumer individualism and competition for consumer status among a large section of the population, and this is expressed in a constant drive for possession of things which are symbols of the individual's social prestige.

Marcuse, highly concerned over the fact of this development of a consumer attitude to life, nevertheless takes an uncritical view of the fetishist notions of the role played by things. He himself also sees a direct connection between the individual's ideological and moral qualities and the things themselves, whose abundance he directly connects with technical progress. In so far as Marcuse is sure that things have a *negative* influence on present-day social life and the activity of the individual (which in the present conditions is also a peculiar critical-fetishist stereotype) there arises in his

view a new basis for denying technical progress as such. As a result, his theory has come to be dominated by the utopian notion that any modern, industrially advanced society quite naturally (in virtue of its advanced character) becomes a "consumer society".

The sources of the poverty and the sharp social contrasts in living standards in the advanced capitalist countries essentially remain outside Marcuse's "critical field of vision", as also the dialectics of the requirements ("the law of rising requirements", as Marx puts it) arising from the individual's development under the scientific and technological revolution. He also takes a "one-dimensional" view of the patent dissatisfaction of the working people in the USA and the European countries with their level of consumption, which is not always an indication of the narrowly consumer attitude to the world and is *very frequently* the result of the legitimate and necessary demands of the working class, demands which Leninism has always taken into account in defining the policy of the revolutionary proletarian movement.

Marcuse frequently gives a negative off-hand critical assessment of the mentality and behaviour of men who are members of a given society, of their needs, aspirations, standards and their everyday life and work, their legitimate desire to improve their working conditions and living standards, to secure greater rights and realise concrete forms of free political action.

Consequently, Marcuse ignores the humanistic importance of the working people's struggle to improve their economic condition, censuring it as a form of conformism, and so essentially echoing the hackneyed "Leftist" demagogues, who insist that the worse people have it, the better for revolution, talk which often seeks to cover up and justify anti-humanistic social practices.

Marcuse always feels a deep sense of disappointment, not to say confusion, when confronting the real contradictions and embryonic awareness among broad sections of the population under capitalism. That is the usual reaction of all utopians. They were well described by Lenin who stressed that "what distinguishes Marxism from the old, utopian socialism is that the latter wanted to build the new society not from the mass human material produced by bloodstained, sordid, rapacious, shopkeeping capitalism, but from very virtuous men and women reared in special hothouses and cu-

cumber frames".* Failing to discover masses of such people, and being unable to deal with the real tendencies and actual properties of the minds and hearts of millions of working people which variously helped to draw men into the revolutionary movement for a radical restructuring of society, Marcuse and similar theorists tragically refer to the "integration" of all social groups and classes.

Marcuse admits, and this should be noted, that the general conceptions bearing on cardinal social change must rest on the tendencies of social development which spring within the framework of the present and which prepare these social changes. But he now and again merely pays lip-service to this correct idea. No wonder, his main book ends with these words: "The critical theory of society possesses no concepts which could bridge the gap between the present and its future; holding no promise and showing no success, it remains negative. Thus it wants to remain loyal to those who, without hope, have given and give their life to the Great Refusal."*** This statement appears to be a logical capstone to the "critical theory" here being analysed.

In most of his writings, Marcuse frankly admits that he fails to see the *real social forces* in the modern world that could carry out a radical and truly socialist transformation of society. This recognition naturally flows from the content of his theory. It is true that in 1964, in his *One-Dimensional Man*, he made a very cursory and general reference to the destructive function in the USA of "the substratum of the outcasts and outsiders", of "the exploited and persecuted of other races and other colors", of "the unemployed and the unemployable"***—all those who are outsiders in that society. Up to a point, this idea had no fundamental part to play in his theoretical conception. In 1965 he formulated the following conclusion: "Socialist theory, no matter how true, can neither prescribe nor predict the future agents of a historical transformation."****

In the last three or four years, the world has witnessed a powerful upsurge in the democratic, humanistic and anti-monopoly movement in the developed capitalist countries, in which ever broader sections of the public are actively

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 28, p. 388.

** Herbert Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man*. . . , p. 257.

*** Ibid., p. 256.

**** *Socialist Humanism*, p. 105.

joining. Marxist-Leninist revolutionary theory takes note of all the changes in these movements seeking to understand their mechanism and to anticipate their advance, actively helping to realise their revolutionary potential. Lenin, a great master of the dialectical analysis of evolution in the minds and feelings of the broad masses of people, said that this awakening came in leaps and bounds and ran a zigzag course, with ebb and flow in the expression of massive revolutionary energy. "Each of these transitions," he stressed, "was prepared ... by the profound changes that had taken place in the conditions of life and in the whole mentality of the working class, as well as by the fact that increasingly wider strata of the working class were roused to more conscious and active struggle. Sometimes these changes took place imperceptibly, the proletariat rallying its forces behind the scenes in an unsensational way, so that the intellectuals often doubted the lasting quality and the vital power of the mass movement. There would then be a turning-point, and the whole revolutionary movement would, suddenly, as it were, rise to a new and higher stage."^{*}

We are already aware that "radical-critical theory", in this case the writings of Marcuse in the form in which they had taken shape by 1965, can and should be regarded as a visual illustration of this kind of "doubt". The point here is how this theory has dealt with the obvious fact of a turning point in the masses' revolutionary movement.

Marcuse's latest articles and statements to the press show some change in his views and in his assessment of the social forces now taking part in the anti-capitalist movement. For instance, in his *One-Dimensional Man*, he says nothing at all about young people, when dealing with the forces taking the most clear-cut stand against modern capitalism. We find the first mention of young people, students, to be more precise, in his introduction to a French edition of the book in 1967. But in his article "End of Utopia", and in his report for the UNESCO symposium on the 150th anniversary of the birth of Marx, Marcuse includes students of various educational institutions among the most active social forces opposing capitalism. In addition, he includes the most "underprivileged" sections of the population, which have sunk to the very "bottom" of bourgeois society (racial minorities in

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 8, p. 211.

the USA, ghetto dwellers, unemployed, and so on), the masses of the neo-colonial world, and some "privileged sections" in the advanced capitalist countries, above all, the "middle class intelligentsia". While welcoming the explosions of their social protest, Marcuse admits—and this needs to be stressed—that they constitute a minority of the population, that they are badly organised, and that none of these groups constitutes the "human basis" of the social process of modern production. He draws the conclusion that "by itself, this opposition cannot be regarded as agent of radical change"* (report at the UNESCO symposium).

But perhaps the most important conclusion in his latest writings is that social revolution cannot be carried out without the modern working class: "The student opposition will play only a secondary role if it fails to emerge from its own narrow little world, if it fails to mobilise the sections which in virtue of their status in society's production process have the decisive role to play in overthrowing the existing system."***

We find, therefore, some changes in Marcuse's latest writings, for he seems to be aware of the events of the past few years. However, even his recognition that a real social revolution cannot take place without the working class (this is the most important new element in his views) is repeatedly hedged with statements that the actual working class in the modern world is solidly "integrated", or even "seeks integration". It is true that during the May events in France, Marcuse expressed the idea that the working class could be politically radicalised in the preparation and at the moment of the crisis itself.

In other words, Marcuse makes no effort to conduct a scientific inquiry into or dialectical theoretical analysis of the real events taking place in the sphere of politics, ideology and economics in the modern world. He takes note of them as an aggregate of empirical and most glaring facts which can be seen with the naked eye. These facts either generate a sense of enthusiasm and faith in progress, or, on the contrary, plunge him into a mood of disappointment and despondency, as protest movements flow and ebb. Now and again, these facts make him admit that this or that proposi-

* *Marx and Contemporary Scientific Thought*, 1969, p. 479.

** *Mondo Nuovo*, May 26, 1968, p. 14.

tion of scientific socialist theory is correct (as the thesis that the collective working class has a leading revolutionary role to play). However, he fails to tie in these propositions with the basic content of his theory, because that would call for a rethinking of his starting methodological principles, and an analysis of the whole range of social contradictions and tendencies actually existing in the modern world.

We find in Marcuse's writings essentially a flat statement of some empirical facts (like the fact that students' riots have taken place and that some sections of scientific, engineering and technical workers have taken part in these riots). Whenever it comes to a theoretical comprehension of these facts, ideological clichés characteristic of the prevailing apologetic thought make themselves felt right away. Thus, in his latest articles about the large groups of workers by brain taking part in the anti-monopoly action, Marcuse inevitably designates them as "middle-class intelligentia". But what is the meaning of "middle classes", a traditional bourgeois term? Is it an indication only of the relatively high living standards (the meaning in which "middle classes" is frequently used in the USA)? Or is it a designation of some "intermediate class" (in which case the question is: between which classes?)? Marcuse never even tries to give a theoretical answer to these questions or to analyse the objective changes taking place in the collective working class as science is transformed into a direct productive force and there is a growth in the army of workers by brain.

Nor does Marcuse note the obvious facts bearing on the traditional sections of the proletariat which testify to the essential changes in the awareness and behaviour of millions of the working people, changes which are being concretely studied and theoretically analysed by Marxists-Leninists. When he looks at these groups of the proletariat, he sees only one thing: the various elements of the consumer individualistic ideology, conformist mentality, and reformist preconceptions among a sizable section of the workers in the USA and the West European countries. This horrifies him and makes him complain about the "transformation"* of the proletariat. But, after all, these facts have almost always been in evidence under the system of capitalist relations and bourgeois economic, political and ideological orga-

* H. Marcuse, *One-Dimensional Man* . . . , p. 24.

nisation, and they have always been considered by the Marxists-Leninists and the Communist Parties when elaborating their scientific programmes of socialist revolution, providing for the organisation of systematic effort to help the workers realise their true common class interests not only for overthrowing capitalism, but also for establishing a fundamentally new, socialist organisation. Marcuse takes a negative view of all the qualities, interests and requirements which could serve to tackle the latter task, and this clearly reveals his *Left-extremist and essentially anarchist attitude*. It is true that, over the past year, there appears to have been some change in Marcuse's idea about the importance of *organisation* for the revolutionary transformation of society. His main writings formulating the basic principles and elements of his theory set out something of a "utopia of anti-organisation", which echoes the traditional principles of anarchism. But after the events in France, the USA and West Germany in 1968, Marcuse told *L'Express*: "I am not an anarchist, because I cannot understand how it is possible to struggle without any organisation against a society which is on the whole organised and is in a state of alert in face of any revolutionary movement."* His recent writings show that he opposes the "organisation of the revolutionary forces" (he admits that on this question his is an "anti-Leninist tendency") and rejects any organisation capable of implementing the task of establishing and scientifically managing a highly industrialised socialist society.

When considering any organisational measures required to transform capitalist society into socialist society, Marcuse starts projecting reforms which fail to go to the roots of the society he criticises, like a "re-establishment of agricultural areas", and "development of social service and medical institutions", urban transport, and so on, or produces utopian schemes designed to "*explode*" the whole system of modern man's needs (cars, refrigerators, washing machines, television, and so on), or again to effect a re-orientation of the whole system of industrial production meeting these needs. For this has to be done within a week or two, with all the plants closed down and everyone going into the countryside.** This is obviously a primitive utopia, revealing com-

* *L'Express*, September 23-29, 1968, p. 56.

** *Ibid.*, p. 58.

plete neglect for the real requirements of the masses and the objective laws underlying the system of modern production development (one need merely recall that in the USA and Britain there is no longer a "countryside" for "everyone" to go to).

We find Marcuse's conception, therefore, to be a utopian "programme" of action directly connected with speculative constructions of an idealist outlook and altogether out of touch with objective scientific information on the contradictory dialectical processes characteristic of the concrete stage in the development of modern society.

This conception is neither original nor unique among the general theoretical schemes which have sprung from the specific conditions of modern capitalism and which variously express the idea about highly industrialised capitalism as an "organised society" in which the antagonistic contradictions have been smoothed out and in which the proletariat (or a greater part of it) has ceased to be revolutionary and has been "integrated" with the system of state-monopoly capitalism.

Another indicative study has been produced by the French sociologist Alain Touraine, entitled *The May Movement in France, or Utopian Communism*,* whose name itself suggests that it is a "Left"-bourgeois response to one of the most remarkable social phenomena in recent years—the May-June events of 1968 in France. The unexpected scale and intensity of the class battles, the active participation in the revolutionary movement of new categories of workers by hand and by brain, the student appeal to the working class, and the sharpening of the problems of power and management in every sphere of social life had the effect of a bombshell on bourgeois and reformist sociologists. Touraine emphasises that the ideology of the "organised", "conflict-free" and "programmed" society did not collapse in the study-room or in the course of theoretical discussions and special inquiries induced by the May events. It was destroyed in the streets. Within a few weeks, the May movement simply swept away the "integration" ideology, whose advocates believed that in "dynamic and affluent" societies large-scale social conflicts were no longer possible.** "It is

* Alain Touraine, *Le mouvement de mai ou le communisme utopique*, Paris, 1968.

** Ibid., p. 279.

no longer possible to conceive our industrial society as a vast organisation concerned with its own development and pushing out the new poor and the unadapted somewhere out onto the periphery. The May movement made quite clear what some new type of conflicts in industry had indicated: the forces capable of waging the struggle are not on the periphery but in the heartland of this programmed society".*

With such an approach Touraine inevitably takes a firm *anti-Marcusean* stand. He holds that the connection between Marcuse's construction and the idyllic pictures of modern capitalism is a fairly typical instance of the dependence between the *immature* social forms of criticism and the content of the apologetic doctrines it attacks. Touraine believes that Marcuseanism has emerged and spread widely because the internal contradictions specific to Western society at the stage of the scientific and technological revolution have yet fully to develop. He adds: "In this instance, criticism is not yet an expression and a result of the development of the internal contradictions in the new society.

"The May movement in France effected the switch from exalted denial to action which brings out the contradiction. In this case the revolutionary struggle was conducted not by those who are excluded from society, but by those who are at its very core, who are most intimately connected with its organs of economic change and development, and who directly experience the rule of large political-economic apparatuses."**

Touraine's attitude to the "integration" ideology as a whole and to its "critical transvestites" of the Marcusean type is mainly expressed in his definition of the main conflict proper to industrial society, as brought out in the May movement, which Touraine characterises as a *class* conflict.

At the same time we find that Touraine's claim to have completely done with the "integration" ideology remains a hollow one, because at least two conceptions constituting the very foundation of that ideology have safely migrated into his own. There is, first, the view of the capitalist class as a rudimentary social group which has given up real power over the economy and social organisation to a new élite of executives (technocrats and technobureaucrats). There is,

* Ibid., p. 282.

** Ibid., p. 275.

second, the assignment of the leading role in the "specifically modern" social conflicts to professionals.

"The central social conflict of our society," says Touraine, "is the conflict between the technocrats, on the one hand, and the white-collar workers and specialists, on the other. The latter confront the former with their education and technical knowledge; at the same time, they feel themselves to be dependent on and governed by them (the technocrats — *Authors*) ... through the mechanisms of career-making, status-seeking and forms of social integration."* Elsewhere Touraine says: "The Italian sociologist Alberoni was right in pointing out that the condition of the workers today is analogous to that of the peasants in the 19th century. This is a social category which is in a state of relative decline, which has to protect specific interests, and which is no longer ... the privileged adversary of the ruling class."** He goes on: "The main motive force of the May revolutionary movement was not the working class but those who could be designated as professionals."***

The professionals (experts, white-collar workers, executives, high-skilled workers, and so on) are the main social categories to which Touraine attaches decisive importance in analysing the May-June events. Within the system of the present-day capitalist organisation this new category of workers by hand and by brain has a dual position.**** The flaw in Touraine's analysis is his inability to take theoretical account of this duality, and his failure to distinguish between the actual problems which are determined by the place of the professionals in the system of labour organised on capitalist lines, and the values, expectations, claims and illusions about themselves, which are determined by their place within the system of bureaucratised business, within the capitalist institutional structure, with a definite mechanism behind the individual career, and by definite conditions of struggle for a place and role in society.

* Alain Touraine, *Le mouvement de mai ou le communisme utopique*, Paris, 1968, p. 177.

** Ibid.

*** Ibid., p. 25.

**** The methodological key for understanding this duality is provided by Lenin's analysis of the contradictory position (and accordingly of the contradictory mentality) of the intelligentsia, as a special group in capitalist society.

Let us make a consistent examination of these two aspects of the social condition of these professionally trained workers.

According to Touraine, the professionals are a special group of wage-workers displaying anxiety about how fully, adequately and effectively society makes use of their competence, skills and knowledge. Their main problem is that of employment, which is common to all working people. The expert whose opinion is given little heed to or is simply ignored; the executive who is not free to make his own decisions; the journalist whose reports are rejected simply because they are objective; the skilled specialist who has to perform unskilled work; all these do in fact feel, though at a new level and in a specific modern form, fundamentally what the "traditional" skilled worker feels, with his constant anxiety about his own industrial skills and experience. The working man's right to the effective use of his knowledge and skills is a specific aspect of *the right to work* arising from the requirements of the scientific and technological revolution. The demands of those who are most immediately affected by this problem and who formulate it in the most acute terms, are essentially a reflection of the demands of all wage-workers which they make *on the conditions and forms in which the scientific and technological revolution is implemented in present-day capitalist society*.

The protest against the social system which is indifferent to knowledge and competence is the old struggle by the working people, developed and expressed in modern terms, against the barbarism of the capitalist organisation of labour, and its irrational character. In this sense, the question of the destinies of professionally trained labour (competence, skill, intelligence, and cultural level of a worker) may be regarded in present-day conditions as an integral expression of the problems which in one way or another bear on the most diverse groups and categories of the working people.

It is indicative that this question, put forward during the May-June 1968 events by both workers and by the future professionals, that is, the students, had a strong impact on the whole of working France. The immediacy and vigour with which the masses stood up in that period for the demands dictated by their interests and by the professional rights of persons with higher qualifications, technicians, laboratory

assistants and so on; the sharp criticism with which they came out against the social organisation which was hostile to genuine competence and professionalism; the steadfastness and determination with which the workers and young people responded to the reprisals which exposed the government—all these commanded much more attention and sympathy than the vociferous revolutionary doctrines propounded by some extremist-minded leaders of the Trotskyite persuasion. Touraine declares that the student movement played the role of detonator with respect to the other sections, which joined the revolutionary process not when the students tried to act as an intelligentsia in the traditional sense of the word (as a category of men enjoying a privileged status with regard to culture and so claiming the role of “teachers of the people”*), but when they discovered with sufficient clarity that their struggle was close to the demands of the young working people, whose problems were close to those of the young people in the technical colleges and vocational schools. In these cases, says Touraine, the college departments operated as “the major suppliers of skilled workers of a definite type and as an essential element of the system of production ensuring the formation of men and their capacity to control the economy and bring about technical and economic change”.**

The specific demands of the new categories of workers by hand and by brain are expressed more consistently and bring out the revolutionary possibilities of this social group more fully as the problems of skills, competence and independent decision-making are felt and seen to be a modern development of the problems of *wage labour*.

These feelings and ideas are now and again obscured by illusions (illusory notions and tenets) common among the professionals, but this aspect of the problem is essentially not dealt with at all by Touraine, although it is important for an understanding of all his writings.

Knowledge and competence are not merely new characteristics of labour (of the producers' labour power, to be more precise). Within the framework of the present-day

* Let us note that that is precisely the role Marcuse assigns to the students in modern social movements.

** Alain Touraine, *Le Mouvement de mai ou le communisme utopique*, p. 57.

bourgeois organisation and the system of commodity-capitalist relations, they also appear as a force impelling especially active participation in the intra-corporative competition.

The young professionals increasingly enter the modern bureaucratised business without possessing either wealth or connections. Their competence is in fact only a special characteristic of their labour power, their only possession as wage-workers. However, it is subjectively regarded as a basis for "advancement", and as something that entitles its owner to a corresponding role in society and production.

No sooner does the professional pursue this socially-programmed motivation than he discovers that knowledge and competence are not at all the mainspring of the actual mechanism of career-making, and that his ascent up the scale depends much more on his capacity for adaptation, for display of loyalty to the "organisation", and the interests and purposes of the ruling class in command of the key positions in the whole system of bourgeois institutions.

This personal experience suggests to the professional that human relations in the organisation *are not arranged as they should be*, that they do not correspond to its nature and objective requirements. Accordingly, he often believes his enemy to be not the objective structure of the bourgeois bureaucracy, but the men, the type of men occupying the upper rungs of the corporate hierarchy and preventing the professionalisation of leadership and power, of which—it is his enlightened opinion—the organisation itself is badly in need. The conflict between skilled labour and the whole system of bureaucratised business increasingly appears to the professional as a conflict between the "competent" and the "incompetent", between the experts and the techno-bureaucrats, between intelligence and the "authoritarian type". Let us note that his awareness may be fully dulled to the fact that the organisation, being a bourgeois-bureaucratic one, has in fact no need at all of any substantial correction of the underlying social mechanism of career-making, which appears to the professional with a technical or engineering education to be distorted and bad, and that the recruiting into the ruling section of men who are not so much competent as possess a definite socio-political orientation, and an enviable gift of refusing to understand certain problems, limited intellectual probity and an authoritarian cast of mind

in fact completely accords with its true essence and its social class character. Failing to understand these objective relations, the professional keeps coming up against obstacles in the way of his advancement, and increasingly feels himself to be a "technocrat without power",* a technocrat whose legitimate claims are trampled in consequence of abuses by the powers that be, that is, feels himself to be the lumpen of the bureaucratic organisation. This explains why among the technical intelligentsia, among the experts, the white-collar workers and certain groups of skilled workers (that is men who are in no sense cast out into the outer areas of industrial organisation, but are, on the contrary, as Touraine puts it, "most closely connected with the organs of economic change and development") there are many who feel themselves to be outsiders. Their feelings often crystallise into the paradoxical form of a pseudo-proletarian consciousness which could be summarised as follows: "We have been deprived of the possibility of belonging to the ruling stratum, which is the legitimate privilege of the competent; so who are we but workers." This sense of identity with the working class, which is an expression of the inferiority complex of the wash-out technocrats, of the "technocrat without power", should in no sense be seen as an expression of the professionals' awareness of being workers. In fact, they come to realise that they are workers only when they put forward, with sincerity and dignity, the specific demands of high-skilled labour, and stand up for their knowledge and competence not as a privilege, or a title to privilege, but as a component part of the class anti-monopoly demands.

Furthermore, the view taken of social relations by the professional as an agent of bureaucratised business determines his view of social relations as a whole. He often sees the incongruities of social life as resulting merely from ignorance and lack of competence and scientific knowledge among the ruling élite. Accordingly, he is inclined to regard the end goal of social change (whatever the concrete circumstances underlying the actual requirements) as consisting in a substitution of a competent and scientifically trained power for the existing incompetent power.

* This expressive term was introduced by some US sociologists (representing social criticism) who had made a study of the condition of some professionals—or as they designate them, "intellectual technicians"—within the system of bureaucratised business.

As the revolutionary working-class movement grows and intensifies its influence, as this movement begins to have a serious bearing on the problem of power, the global doctrines and schemes for the salvation of society nurtured by the "neo-technocrats" are invalidated and fall apart. It transpires that they are inapplicable to reality, that they do not contain any concrete answers to basic social problems, and that they are frequently in no sense a response to them. The "professionally competent" aspirants to power suddenly discover that they are incapable of producing any truly new constructive programme for developing and transforming society to counter the ideology of the incompetent powers that be. Step by step, the revolutionary movement makes it obvious that professional qualifications and competence do not in any sense imply a capacity for social leadership, which entails a profound understanding of the requirements of social development as a coherent process, ability to rally the broadest masses of people round definite historical ideals, and so on.

The twisted forms of the professional's self-consciousness, determined by his status within the system of bureaucratised business, and the most important expressions and the sequence of phases in the crisis of his notions about the aims of mass revolutionary action and his claims to hegemony and social leadership—all these were clearly expressed in the ideology of the student movement in France in May and June 1968.*

* The purpose here is not to give an exhaustive analysis of the movement or to show the content of all the moods it expressed, but to describe the ideology of that section of the students and its socially-programmed form of consciousness, which, first, prevented the young professionals from understanding their actual connection with the struggle of the whole wage-labour army, and second, paralysed their immediate moral and emotional reactions to reality and their revolutionary and humanistic aspirations. The "young-technocratic" ideology not only hampered the students in developing a theoretically adequate conception of existing society and their status within it, but also prevented them from remaining consistent *democrats*, and maintaining the strong feeling of social justice which was so clearly expressed at definite stages of the movement. The May-June 1968 events in France showed once again that when it comes to mass action false ideology is not only opposed to scientifically adequate theory, but also (something that is frequently underestimated) to the moral purity of the motives, the class interests of the proletariat, and the immediate humanistic motives of those taking part in the struggle.

Implementation of the important social task for which the French working people also fought—the task of giving revolutionary expression to the demands which spring from the profound conflict with the state-monopoly organisation and the whole system of bureaucratised business—was from the very outset blocked by the peculiar view taken by some student leaders of the essence of the policy pursued by the “technocracy” as a special socio-psychological type of men in power. Any clear and objective exposure of the existing system was drowned out by the abuses heaped on this section and even by the personal attacks on its individuals. Touraine gives very many facts showing that objective socio-psychological criticism was transformed into socio-psychological criticism and even pamphleteering attacks, and adds: “The scandal or abuse which accompanies revolutionary protest is sooner a sign of social pathology than a means of struggle.”*

These tendencies are variously expressed in the Western countries. In France, they were most pronounced in May and June 1968, as will be seen from this students’ handbill addressed to the workers: “At one time we were a handful of persons with future privileges. . . . Today we constitute *much too great a ‘minority’*. . . . That is the contradiction facing us bourgeois children. We are no longer sure of our future status of leaders. This is *the only source of our revolutionary attitude*. . . . Henceforth we are working people like everyone else.”

This is a very valuable document for its ingenuousness and political naïveté.

It would be highly rash to reduce the whole content of the handbill to the admission by the students (the future professionals) that they do in fact belong to the working people. The last sentence is not only a statement of awareness of the actual situation, but a conclusion following from a line of reasoning.

The paradoxical status of a “much too great a minority” is what the authors of the handbill are immediately concerned with and entirely concentrated on. This highly characteristic expression very clearly conveys the substance of the matter: the professional feels himself to be a member

* Alain Touraine, *Le mouvement de mai ou le communisme utopique*, p. 216.

of a privileged section, but already as a spurious and massively constituted "lumpen of the élite".

The most revealing part of the handbill is undoubtedly the flat statement that *uncertainty about their future status as leaders* is the source of revolutionary attitudes among such professionals. That, too, is the real source of their awareness of belonging to the working people (their "identity with the working people", to use the exact socio-psychological term). The working people, wage-workers, are not a group of which the authors of the handbill in fact feel to be members. They are a group in which the professionals include themselves because they are aware of their actual inability to belong to the ruling élite.

Social psychology tells us that the object of "identification" is to some extent often idealised. For many young professionals, who took part in the May movement, the working people, the working class, were precisely the inner ideal, the ideal fostered in the mind of the "lumpen of the élite", corresponding to their ideas of the revolution and the revolutionary spirit, their bitterness and hatred. Whenever the actions of the real working class failed to correspond to this image, when it turned out that its actual interests were not identical with those it should have had in accordance with the conceptions of the "technocrat without power", who included himself among the working people, the workers were instantly accused of opportunism, degeneration, and "failure as a class to be equal to its historical mission". These charges were levelled when the bulk of the workers actively opposed the policy of the monopolies and when they displayed revolutionary realism by rejecting reckless schemes for revolution.

However it may appear paradoxical at first sight, the subjective and incorrect view of their "identity" with the working class prevented a section of the students from seeing the way to interacting with the working-class movement itself, the way of understanding the actual revolutionary possibilities, requirements and interests of that class. It also prevented the professionals themselves from realising that objectively they belong with the exploited, and from formulating the problems of professionally trained and competently skilled labour as being those of wage-labour. The excessive, ultra-revolutionary expectations of the "lumpen élite" and its extremist aspirations and claims were

obstacles in the way of shaping the professional workers' revolutionary awareness.

Extremist ideas were represented in the ideology of the May student movement with unparalleled completeness and diversity. The ecstatic calls and incantations, the impassioned speeches about armed uprising and overthrow of the government—hasty borrowings from Blanqui and Kropotkin, Trotskyism and other Leftist doctrines—clearly revealed some of the hesitations and the peculiar view of the question of power.

Touraine insists (and this is perhaps one of the most interesting passages in his work) that the struggle of the university students and lycée pupils in May 1968 was in fundamental content neither a student nor a youth movement in the conventional sense of the word. In this instance, totally new interests and demands—those of the professionals—were carving their way in the form of students' and young people's action.

However, this is clearly at variance with Touraine's attempt to ascribe to the youth form of movement everything that he does not like or finds jarring in *this movement and its ideology*.

The essential contradictions of this ideology should logically be explained not by the fact that in this instance the young generation and the professionals were represented and clashed in the same person, but by the twofold character of the professional himself, the fact that he simultaneously belongs to the new type of wage-worker and to the "technocrats without power". As has been said, there is not even a hint of any consistent explanation by Touraine on these lines.

He insists that the Left-radical feelings, the illusory "identity", the social doctrinaire attitudes, and so on, prevented the participants in the movement from becoming aware of the basic class conflict of the advanced industrial society in France, and acting in accordance with its content and requirements. But this general assertion becomes meaningless as soon as we recall that Touraine takes the basic class conflict of modern society to be a clash between "technocrats", on the one hand, and white-collar workers and experts, on the other, a clash which develops on the basis of "career-making, status-seeking ... and forms of cultural integration".

However, a more profound and comprehensive analysis (which was done by the French Communists) shows that the basic class contradiction expressed in the revolutionary events of May-June 1968 in France is *the conflict between capital and labour, involving highly skilled labour, competence and knowledge*; that this conflict resulted in the greatest clash over the last few decades between the mass of working people and state-monopoly capitalism in that country. But because there is nothing of the sort in Touraine's work, we are struck by this contradiction: where Touraine is critical, he is inconsistent, and where he is consistent, he is uncritical.

The thesis of the "integration" of the working class, and the "young-technocratic" ideology are both qualified as two types of utopia contrasting each other. The specific expectations of the ruling section (representatives of the bourgeois "technobureaucracy") are the "utopia of modernisation"—hopes of a planned, conflict-free improvement of the functionally coherent social organism meeting the interests of all classes and groups. Touraine contrasts these hopes with the aspirations of the young professionals, which most clearly stood out in the last few days of the students' disorders in the Sorbonne and hopes of a future society representing the maximum possible de-integration of individuals within a social entity. The latter is seen as a free association excluding any institutions, any form of hierarchy, any extra-personal, objectively anonymous relations between men.

This patently fantastic and non-constructive notion (it does not take any analysis to expose this) is very aptly designated by Touraine as the "anti-society utopia", which he believes has the revolutionary-critical meaning of divulging the principal secrets of the existing society, of exposing violence, which lurks behind all manner of paternalistic measures, and behind action ostensibly dictated by considerations of rationalisation and concern for the welfare of the "social whole". In the "anti-society utopia", the vibrant urge for independent decision-making, freedom of personal initiative and responsibility neighbours on complete indifference to the objective difficulties of social development (in particular and above all, economic difficulties) and to the problems of the truly revolutionary transformation of existing society, an indifference which is in crying contradiction with the spirit of accusations which the advocates of the

"anti-society utopia" level at the ruling élite ("the power of the technocrats does not accord with the inner requirements of economic and social rationality").

How are we to explain this contradiction? Why is it that men who reproach the powers that be of failing to be equal to the objective social requirements do not even try to put forward any constructive scheme of social change meeting these requirements?

Touraine's answer to these questions boils down to the following. The obviously non-constructive character of the "young technocrats'" notions of the future is due to the fact that the professionals are merely an emergent new section which has yet to realise its actual place in the economy and its basic conflict with the "new ruling class" ("the technocrats") which is why it suffers from the lack of self-confidence which all emergent social categories display. The professionals do not yet have their own forms of political class thinking, or social and economic foresight, but are already unable to accept the constructive prognostications and theoretical notions of the future "formed on the basis of the class struggle against private property and private profit".

This is the core of Touraine's conception and demands the most thorough analysis.

The "anti-society utopia" undoubtedly reproduces the actual typical feelings of the new category of workers by hand and by brain who confront the difficulties of putting to use their highly qualified knowledge and competence.

However, it is a reflection not only of these feelings, not only of the professionals' natural concern for the problems of independent decision-making, responsibility and initiative. It is also a reflection of their pathological fixation on these problems, and their unwarranted isolation of these problems from other vital ones bearing on *all* wage-labourers.

The "anti-society utopia" is a record not only of the legitimate specific demands of the professionals, but also of their claim to be a separate class distinct from the other categories of working people, and to having their social-group interests set up as universal interests. Therein lies the true cause of the non-constructive character of the "young technocrats'" scheme of the future, and its detachment from the tasks of bringing about revolutionary change in the existing socio-economic system.

The "anti-society utopia" rests on another and more profound utopian notion—the notion that the "neo-technocrat" belongs to an exclusive class, to a social category which is well ahead of all the other groups in social experience, which is why it has left behind the "traditional problems" of material existence, organisation of the economic process, and improvement of living conditions. This view is closely connected with the "neo-technocrats'" hegemonistic claims and has the same origin: lost hopes to a privileged status are compensated by notions of a privileged position in the hierarchy of the main social groups and within the system of historical action.

Touraine's explanation of the "anti-society utopia" once again reveals the basic contradiction in his work, the contradiction between the claim and the actual content of his conception.

Touraine seeks to take a critical and objective view of the "anti-society utopia", and clearly delineates the limited and negatively critical character of this scheme of the future, warning of the dangerous tendencies which it could produce in the social movement today. He says: "Unless constructive aims, strategy and negotiation prospects are outlined, the one-sided accentuation of spontaneity and direct democracy threatens to produce irrational reactions and manipulation of the crowd by separate groups and individuals."*

Nevertheless, in line with the objective logic of his conception, Touraine comes out in defence of the main utopian view which is at the root of the "anti-society utopia", the view that the professionals belong to an exclusive historical class, that they are a privileged group distinct from other sections and groups of the working people.

He insists on a "deepening and development" of this illusory awareness of class independence, a deepening and development which in reality could lead only to more pronounced socio-group egoism, and a morbid fixation on overstated historical claims and expectations.

It is true that under the scientific and technological revolution the category of professionally trained workers, with their knowledge and competence, is a very rapidly growing group of working people, and that in the foreseeable future

* Alain Touraine, *Le mouvement de mai ou le communisme utopique*, p. 50.

it may well constitute the greater part of the population in the advanced industrial capitalist countries, so that as this process goes forward, the problem of professionally trained labour is bound increasingly to become an issue in the class struggle against bourgeois exploitation. But that does not at all mean that the professionals are crystallising into a new "vanguard class", that they are entitled to enshrine their specific problems as universal ones, or to treat the universal problems of the working class as "specific" and "traditional", and as "produced by the obsolescent system of social relations".

The ideology of historical class exclusiveness, which breeds indifference to the requirements and needs of the bulk of the working people, has always been the main danger for sections and groups going over to more active positions in the revolutionary struggle. Lenin repeatedly warned against this danger. In his examination of the vanguard role of the most class-conscious representatives of the proletariat with respect to the working class as a whole, of the vanguard role of the working class itself with respect to the rest of the working people, Lenin showed that they could successfully play this role only if they were capable of giving consistent revolutionary formulation to the demands and interests of *all the exploited*.

An important task of the revolutionary movement is to overcome these divisions within the class, to resist any attempts to subordinate the workers to capitalist "integration", and to oppose the latter with a united front, that is, the united action of all groups and categories of the working people for their common, basic aims. The role of vanguard can in fact be played only by sections of the working class which are able to solve this task of uniting all the exploited.

* * *

A most important specific feature of the development of the scientific socialism theory, which distinguishes it from diverse varieties of utopianism, was characterised by Lenin in the following words: "Under no circumstances does Marxism confine itself to the forms of struggle possible and in existence at the given moment only, recognising as it does that new forms of struggle, unknown to the participants of

the given period, *inevitably* arise as the given social situation changes. In this respect Marxism *learns*, if we may so express it, from mass practice, and makes no claims whatsoever to *teach* the masses forms of struggle invented by 'systematisers' in the seclusion of their studies."*

In the real movement of social knowledge utopia is anti-theoretical not merely to theory, but to the dialectical unity of theory and practice, theory summing up the experience in the class struggle of the working class, which is ceaselessly enriched and corrected by the revolutionary creativity of the working people. The struggle for such unity, which makes proletarian ideology truly scientific, is a most important distinctive feature of Lenin's approach to questions of theory.

He wrote: "The world's greatest movement for liberation of the oppressed class, the most revolutionary class in history, is impossible without a revolutionary theory. That theory cannot be thought up. It *grows out of* the sum total of the revolutionary experience and the revolutionary thinking of all countries in the world."** In the modern epoch there is more urgency than ever before in Lenin's idea that theoretical work by real Marxists is incompatible with any form of social utopianism. Lenin stressed: "The socialist intelligentsia can expect to perform fruitful work only when they abandon their illusions and begin to seek support . . . in actual, and not possible social-economic relations. Moreover, their *THEORETICAL* work must be directed towards the *concrete study of all forms of economic antagonism. . . , the study of their connections and successive development; they must reveal this antagonism wherever it has been concealed by political history, by the peculiarities of legal systems or by established theoretical prejudice.* They must *present an integral picture of our realities. . . .*"***

While urging consistent criticism of any utopian conceptions, Lenin demanded that every concrete form of social utopianism should be given a differentiated objective class and political assessment, and insisted that a distinction should be made between reactionary utopias slowing down revolutionisation of the masses, blocking historical progress and

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 11, pp. 213-14.

** Ibid., Vol. 21, p. 354.

*** Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 296.

fettering the initiatives of the masses, and the utopian views and feelings which are a product and a peculiar expression and even stimulator of revolutionary energy, new forms of working people's initiatives which spring from the objective logic of development of class contradictions and the class struggle.

An important task of Marxist sociologists is to make a concrete and critical analysis of the utopian views and feelings of student youth and the sections of the scientific and technical intelligentsia which in fact actively join in the anti-imperialist struggle. It should help to make them aware of the theory of scientific socialism and communism and to invigorate their revolutionary constructive action.

The ideological struggle against modern forms of social utopianism, of which Marcuse and Touraine are influential spokesmen, is designed to help the revolutionary working-class movement to make a correct assessment of new phenomena in the development of bourgeois society, to bring out its real contradictions, to give a scientific refutation in the light of creative Marxism-Leninism of the futile attempts to play down the mission of the working class in the revolutionary process, and at the same time to define the real forms of the hegemony of the proletariat in alliance with the anti-monopoly and anti-imperialist forces.

* * *

One of Lenin's historical achievements is the theoretical formulation and practical elaboration of a number of cardinal problems connected with the definition of ways, means and forms of building the new society in the conditions of backward socio-economic structures in the East. Lenin was essentially the first man to raise the problem in the epoch of imperialism. Addressing representatives of communist organisations of the peoples of the East in 1919, he said: "In this respect you are confronted with a task which has not previously confronted the Communists of the world: relying upon the general theory and practice of communism, you must adapt yourselves to the specific conditions such as do not exist in the European countries; you must be able to apply that theory and practice to conditions in which the bulk of the population are peasants, and in which the task is to wage a struggle against medieval survivals and not

against capitalism.”* Solution to these problems, as Lenin said, was not to be found at the time “in any communist book”; it was necessary “to translate the true communist doctrine, which was intended for the Communists of the more advanced countries, into the language of every people”.**

Lenin’s writings in the post-revolutionary period sum up the early practical experience of socio-economic transformation in the former colonial outskirts of tsarist Russia, and outline the ways of their approach to socialist construction.

Shedding light on this complex of problems, Lenin laid special emphasis on the need to take account in practical work of the initial socio-economic level of the countries of the East, where most peoples “are typical representatives of the working people—not workers who have passed through the school of capitalist factories, but typical representatives of the working and exploited peasant masses who are victims of medieval oppression”.*.*.* The switch of this mass of working peasants to the socialist way calls for a number of intermediate stages. And if “a backward country can easily begin because its adversary has become rotten, because its bourgeoisie is not organised . . . for it to continue demands of that country a hundred thousand times more circumspection, caution and endurance”.*.*.*.* In a letter to the Communists of the Transcaucasian Republics, which had “an even more pronounced peasant character than Russia”, Lenin insistently advised them “to practice more moderation and caution, and show more readiness to make concessions to the petty bourgeoisie, the intelligentsia, and particularly the peasantry”.*.*.*.*

These theoretical conclusions of Lenin’s, enriched with his concept of the non-capitalist way of development, have been borne out by the practice of social change in the socialist republics of the Soviet East and in socialist Mongolia.

In the new historical conditions, when there is a real prospect of an advance towards socialism by once backward countries, especial significance attaches to the creative

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 161.

** Ibid., p. 162.

*** Ibid., p. 161.

**** Ibid., Vol. 27, p. 291.

***** Ibid., Vol. 32, p. 317.

assimilation of this experience. There is good reason, therefore, why the attention of Marxists and revolutionary-democratic parties and groups today is once again focussed on Lenin's ideas about the ways of developing the new society in the East.

A sharp ideological struggle is being fought over Lenin's propositions, which are opposed by the enemies of Marxism-Leninism of every stripe, ranging from the Right revisionists to the "ultra"-revolutionaries.

The present stage of the class struggle in the international arena is characterised by the growing influence of the socialist system on the whole of world social development, and these are the conditions in which the current upswing in the anti-imperialist, including the national liberation, struggle of the peoples is taking place.

Contrary to the assertions of various adversaries of scientific communism, the international working class and its main achievement—the world socialist system—are at the centre of our epoch. However hard the latest "critics" (notably the modern Right and "Left" revisionists) may try to play down or distort proletarian socialism, they will never manage to obscure for broad masses of working people in every continent the vast and growing influence of the revolutionary working class, and its policy and scientific outlook on the international situation.

Of course, Marxists-Leninists do not close their eyes to the complex problems, including new ones, which arise as the world-wide revolutionary-liberation movement goes forward.

Leninism has always proceeded from the fact that the extension of the international front of anti-imperialist struggle, participation in the world revolutionary movement of ever broader sections of the population, and the consequent growing diversity of concrete forms of massive struggle for deep-going political, social and economic revolutionary change reflect the inevitable progressive phenomena connected with the advance of the socio-historical process. The Marxist-Leninist Parties believe that this natural extension of the social base of the world revolutionary process should in no sense result in a "dissolution" of the working class, and of its class demands and scientific outlook in the massive general democratic movement and the ideological conceptions expressing the interests of the non-proletarian sections. The

greater the consistency with which the working class and its organisations implement their principled ideological-political line, the greater the effect with which it combines the struggle for the vital needs of the masses with defence of its ultimate aims, the more successful is the proletariat's class struggle itself and the massive general democratic movement (peasant action, anti-imperialist movements, mass struggle in defence of peace, and so on).

However, advocates of petty-bourgeois socialism of every stripe have sought and are still seeking artificially to contrast the interests of the working class with those of the non-proletarian sections of the working people. In this connection, there has been some spread of the ideas propounded by Frantz Fanon and his followers in the developing countries.

On the one hand, the latest type of "peasant socialism" theories do expose colonialism and "white" racism. Fanon, for instance, justly notes that "colonialism is incapable of procuring for the colonised peoples the material conditions".* He writes about the forced evolution of the forms of colonialism and racism, adding that since the Second World War the need to secure some approval and support, and co-operation from the natives has made colonial relations less brutal, and more refined and camouflaged.

But on the other hand, in his criticism of the colonial system, Fanon and his followers seek to set up against the Marxist-Leninist analysis of the socio-economic substance of the national liberation movement another doctrine mainly reflecting the over-sensitive nationalism of the oppressed "coloured" peoples.

The main idea running through Fanon's writings is essentially that the "coloured" peoples' revolution is "exclusive", because in contrast to the white nations of a decadent Europe they can create a new civilisation without exploitation or oppression.

Those who spread these ideas borrow from Marxism its recognition of the need and inevitability of social revolution, but they often distort its class content, by substituting for the proletarian revolution a kind of racial revolution of "blacks against whites". Fanon says that the Third World

* Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, New York, 1968, p. 208.

has the historic mission of establishing a new human society. His theory of the "revolution of the oppressed coloured peoples" is based on the following propositions: (a) a call for a world-wide re-distribution of wealth; (b) designation of the national liberation movement as the "decisive" revolutionary force of our day; (c) characteristic of the poor peasantry and the lumpen proletariat as the social mainstay and motive force of the revolution; and (d) justification of anarchy and unlimited violence.

While presenting to colonialism a harsh and heavy bill, ideologists like Fanon draw the false conclusion that the main contradiction of the modern world is not between world capitalism and world socialism, but in the discrepancy of living standards of the "white" and the "poor coloured" peoples. They see the "incorrect, unfair" international distribution of wealth as the root of all evil.

The extent to which some ideologists of petty-bourgeois extremism tend to confuse different conceptions is amazing. Their theoretical constructions ignore the demands for a scientific and objective analysis of their subject.

It is fundamentally wrong, says Leninism, to equate the imperialist countries and their ruling circles, which have plundered vast masses of the globe's population (including the proletariat at home) for centuries, and countries which had once been oppressed by the imperialists, and had escaped their domination at the price of heroic struggle by masses of working people, headed by the working class and its revolutionary vanguard. Objectively, this non-class approach does nothing but play into the hands of the international reactionaries.

Ideologists of petty-bourgeois radicalism, like Fanon, assume that all those who do not belong to the oppressed peoples of the Third World are their enemies, including not only the foreign imperialists, but also the working class of the metropolitan countries; not only the European capitalists, but also the workers and intellectuals of European stock resident in the colonies. They turn the edge of their criticism against the international working class and against its unity with the national liberation movement.

Fanon's followers insist that the whole working class in the metropolitan countries enjoys the fruits of the oppressed peoples' exploitation. However, Leninism has shown, and this has been borne out by life, that the burdens of colonial

wars, the cost of maintaining the colonial machine of oppression always fall on the shoulders of the broad masses of working people. Only the imperialist monopolies, and the top privileged layer of the "working-class aristocracy", have stood to gain from colonial exploitation.

Fanon and his followers present the national liberation movement as virtually the only revolutionary force of our day, which is transforming the face of the world and is the chief and decisive factor of world social progress. In full conformity with this unscientific approach, they ultimately come to minimise the great role that world socialism has played and is playing in stimulating the victorious development of national liberation revolutions.

Spokesmen for this type of petty-bourgeois socialism believe the peasantry to be the main social force capable of carrying out the national and the social revolutions. They insist that it is least subject to the corrupting influence of colonialism, which is why it remains the "healthiest" and most revolutionary class of colonial and post-colonial society.

Fanon assures us that "in the colonial countries the peasants alone are revolutionary, for they have nothing to lose and everything to gain".*

Why is this so? Because the peasantry, Fanon and his followers allege, is much poorer than all the other classes, hence it has a stake in "a complete demolishing of all existing structures".**

Such theories clearly reveal the class, non-proletarian origin of petty-bourgeois socialism, of which Lenin wrote: "The chief representative, or the chief social bulwark, of this . . . bourgeoisie that is still capable of supporting a historically progressive course, is the peasant."***

The "Left"-wing opponents of scientific socialism quite unreasonably deny the revolutionary and vanguard role of the working class. Characteristically, they have the greatest sympathies for the lumpen proletariat. It will be easily seen that here again their "theories" mark a fundamental break with revolutionary Marxism, which has demonstrated that "the 'dangerous class', the social scum, that passively rot-

* Frantz Fanon, *The Wretched of the Earth*, p. 61.

** Ibid., p. 11.

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 165.

ting mass thrown off by the lowest layers of old society, may, here and there, be swept into the movement by a proletarian revolution, its conditions of life, however, prepare it far more for the part of a bribed tool of reactionary intrigue".*

Such conceptions propounded by modern "Left" opportunists and extremists do not spring from the basic interests of the revolutionary struggle of the proletariat, which rallies all the oppressed masses, but most frequently reflect the aspirations of the many participants in spontaneous riots staged by poor peasants and lumpen elements.

The facts indicate that in the last few years *the young, rapidly growing working class has been ever more actively asserting itself in developing countries* as the most consistent fighter against imperialist oppression and its consequences, and against colonial oppression and the policy of neo-colonialism.** It is the working class that has been doing most for these countries' socio-economic progress, in a tremendous effort to overcome their age-old backwardness. The growth of the working-class movement is having a positive effect on social life in the developing countries, helping to overcome national strife and tribal dissent. There is convincing evidence that the working people of the developing countries are taking an active part in the general international struggle against imperialism, and for real social progress.

Defining the Communists' attitude to revolutionary petty-bourgeois socialism, Lenin warned that it was simultaneously necessary, "while criticising petty-bourgeois utopias and reactionary views", "to single out, defend and develop the revolutionary democratic core of its political and agrarian programme".***

At the same time, Leninism holds that petty-bourgeois radicalism is incapable of advancing and consistently im-

* Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, Moscow, 1969, p. 118.

** For details see Section V of the present book (pp. 382-99); see also: *The Working Class and the Anti-Imperialist Revolution in Asia, Africa and Latin America*, Russ. ed., Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1969; *The Working-Class Movement in the Countries of Asia and North Africa at the Present Stage*, Russ. ed., Nauka Publishers, Moscow, 1969, (issued with the participation of members of the Institute of the International Working-Class Movement of the USSR Academy of Sciences).

*** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 18, p. 169.

plementing any constructive programme. This inevitably demands sustained and organised effort by all the contingents of the international working class and their skilful support of all the anti-imperialist movements.

The states of the socialist community are the most powerful anti-imperialist force in the world arena. Despite all the obstacles and difficulties arising in the development of the international revolutionary-liberation process, they have been steadfastly working to consolidate the unity of the ranks of the world-wide anti-imperialist front, being guided by the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism.

**PROLETARIAN INTERNATIONALISM,
THE BASIS FOR STRONGER COHESION
OF THE WORLD REVOLUTIONARY
WORKING-CLASS MOVEMENT**

Proletarian internationalism, which is an expression of the common condition and interests of the working people of all countries, has been and remains the governing principle of the Marxists-Leninists' theoretical and practical activity. It is a reliable guide for a correct solution of the problem of the relation between national and international tasks in the working-class movement. Any departure from it results in a weakening of the international revolutionary movement and the emergence of nationalistic and particularist tendencies. Summing up the early steps of the European working-class movement, Marx wrote in the Inaugural Address of the Working Men's International Association: "Past experience has shown how disregard of that bond of brotherhood which ought to exist between the workmen of different countries and incite them to stand firmly by each other in all their struggle for emancipation, will be chastised by the common discomfiture of their incoherent efforts."*

The principles and ideas of the international solidarity of the working people, theoretically substantiated by Marx and Engels, were creatively developed and enriched by Lenin, who took a firm stand for the unity of the world's proletariat in the new historical epoch. Lenin insisted that the international solidarity of the working class was a con-

* Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 2, Moscow, 1969, p. 17.

dition of its victory, and gave a clear formulation of what it meant: "There is one, and only one, kind of real internationalism, and that is—working wholeheartedly for the development of the revolutionary movement and the revolutionary struggle in *one's own* country, and supporting (by propaganda, sympathy, and material aid) *this struggle*, this, and *only this*, line, in *every* country without exception."^{*}

The problem of striking the right balance between the national and the international can be fully understood only in the broad prospect of society's historic development, because its origins lie deep in the world-wide socio-economic and political processes. That is how the problem was formulated and solved by the founders of scientific communism in their doctrine of social development. They proceeded from the category of the universal—the social—which bears in general on a given historical type of society, or social formation, and the particular—the national—which bears only on the individual society or country.

As they studied bourgeois society in the mid-19th century, Marx and Engels assumed that under capitalism the contradiction between the socially universal and the nationally particular was fully resolved, if not in essence, through the elimination of national distinctions, then at any rate in form, through the establishment of a level of social development common to all the advanced countries. From this they logically deduced the hypothesis that socialist revolution would simultaneously destroy capitalism in all or in most advanced capitalist countries.

This proposition, historically justified during the rise of capitalism, has lost its theoretical and practical meaning in the epoch of imperialism, with its pronounced and extremely uneven development of the world capitalist system.

At the very start of his inquiry, Lenin put the finishing touches to the ideas of Marx and Engels on the nature of national development under capitalism, when he said that "the creation of these nationalities was nothing else than the creation of bourgeois ties".^{**} This idea of the unity of social and national development under capitalism subsequently had an important part to play. The social-class

^{*} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 24, p. 75.

^{**} *Ibid.*, Vol. 1, p. 155.

factor determines the substance and the content of this process, whereas the national factor gives form to and individualises it in accordance with the conditions in each given country. Lenin invariably regarded the social-class factor as the leading and definitive one, and the national factor as the subordinate and secondary one.

Inquiring into the development of national relations in the capitalist epoch, Lenin established two interconnected historical tendencies in this development: the first is expressed in the national consolidation of society, and the second, the leading one, by contrast in the internationalisation of the social life of the people. He added: "Both tendencies are a universal law of capitalism."* Viewed in the light of this law, the relation between the social and the national under capitalism is found to reveal that the contradiction within it is manifested in the development of both tendencies, but is in both instances resolved only relatively and partially.

The objective development of capitalism is polycentric, as determined by earlier historical development. The capital of this or that country, however strong and mature, is in advance deprived of any monopoly to a dominant role in the development of the world capitalist system. Its claims to such a monopoly clash with the claims of other national capitals. The striving of the capital of this or that country for hegemony is, consequently, expressed through sharpening economic and political contradictions, which are manifested with varying force at different concrete historical periods.

Under the domination of capitalism, the second tendency indicated by Lenin—internationalisation—also proceeds in contradictory forms. The imperialist "integration" of nations is based on the master-and-servant relationship, and is designed to consolidate the system of exploitation. It runs in the form of associations of capitals-framed-within-states into supra-national monopoly-oligarchic coalitions of the Common Market type, which betray the peoples' national interests and promote their own selfish ends. In virtue of the antagonisms inherent in capitalism, such imperialist associations take the form of closed groups ranged against each other. A struggle for hegemony is going on both within the integrated complexes and between them.

* Ibid., Vol. 20, p. 27.

Lenin's analysis of the social and national antagonisms at the imperialist stage of capitalism showed that the contradiction between the socially universal and the nationally particular was insoluble on a bourgeois basis either in substance or in form, and this suggested the conclusion that socialism could initially win out in a few countries or even in one individual country.

This brilliant conclusion embodies the dialectical unity of the social content, national form and international character of the objective process of world historical development. It has become one of the main starting points for the strategic orientation of the anti-capitalist struggle of the working people of all countries. It continues to be meaningful for practice throughout the whole epoch of socialist revolutions.

* * *

In the epoch of bourgeois revolutions and in the immediate period that followed the objective factors of historical development themselves determined the resolution of the contradiction between the socially universal and the nationally particular in accordance with the interests of capital, that is, through an identification of the bourgeois and the national. Of course, even then this identification was highly relative, because the contradictions between the interests of the bourgeoisie and the aspirations of the non-propertyied sections had come to the surface long before capitalism won out. But on the whole, the bourgeoisie's class interests coincided with the national interest.

As capitalism developed, as social antagonisms sharpened and as the proletariat's class consciousness grew, the idea that the bourgeoisie and the nation had identical interests lost its objective content, with the relative identity of the national and the bourgeois being in reality transformed into an absolute contradiction between a handful of capitalists and the labouring masses of the nation. The idea of the identity of interests persists, however, but is merely transformed from a reality into an illusion and is now preserved no longer in virtue of historically-rooted factors, but in virtue of the fetishist character of the capitalist mode of production. As a result, private property relations and the exploitation of wage-labour by capital based on them are seen as natural and necessary foundations for the nation's

existence, and the nation itself as a union of equal holders of commodities.

Lenin exposed the class character of this phenomenon and showed that in reality every bourgeois nation consisted of "two nations", a nation of proprietors and a nation of working people, whose interests are poles apart. Analysing this contradiction between the social and the national from inside, from the standpoint of the class antagonisms constituting it, Lenin proved that it could be overcome only through a resolution of the basic contradiction of capitalism, that between the social character of labour and the private capitalist form of appropriation, that is, only through socialist revolution.

In its efforts to back up the illusion of "national unity", capital resorts, especially in present-day conditions, to social manoeuvring. By identifying the national interest with that of the imperialist state, the bourgeoisie seeks to provide the myth of "national unity" with a political and ideological basis, if not a social one. The main dogma of bourgeois nationalism is that "the whole nation is a single class", an idea borrowed from one of its apostles, Oswald Spengler, the ideological forerunner of nazism. Bourgeois and petty-bourgeois ideologists exaggerate the influence of national relations on social development and regard world politics as a spontaneous interplay of nationalistic forces which will most probably plunge mankind into a "war of everyone against all".

While rejecting the bourgeois ideologists' view of nationalism, together with their assessment of the importance of national relations in the modern world, Marxists do not deny either that nationalism is a functionally independent and highly active sphere of social consciousness or that it exerts a great, and in some conditions, decisive influence on the ideological and political orientation of various, including large, social groups and parties, or even that the use of nationalism by the reactionary forces may well have disastrous consequences for mankind's future.

At the same time, Marxism-Leninism rejects the abstract approach to nationalism. Lenin said that in defining the essence of nationalism and assessing its importance it was necessary to proceed from an analysis of the socio-economic and political conditions producing this or that concrete expression of it, and that "to talk of national sentiment as

an independent factor is only to obscure the essence of the matter".* Emphasising the fundamental distinction between the bourgeoisie's and the proletariat's view of the national factor, he wrote: "The bourgeoisie always places its national demands in the forefront, and does so in categorical fashion. With the proletariat, however, these demands are subordinated to the interests of the class struggle."** This fundamental class standpoint of Lenin's has been adopted by the Communists as the starting point in assessing the political role of nationalism in the modern world.

The twentieth century has seen many instances of the fatal influence of bourgeois nationalism on the social development of peoples and on the international situation as a whole, but one example—nazism—will suffice to show the real threat latent in any resurgence of reactionary nationalism. This example is the more horrible that millions of Germans, intoxicated with great-power chauvinism, took part in the effort to realise it. Mankind was able to crush nazism, but the idea of the "Thousand-Year Reich" has not disappeared with its inventor. It continues to live in West German neo-nazism, which is once again seeking to turn it into the central pivot of a "great German national consciousness".

Since the war, fascist-type nationalistic ideas have spread throughout the imperialist world, invariably as companions of bellicose anti-Sovietism and anti-communism.

It remains a constant task of the Marxist-Leninist Parties to combat such ideas.

The situation in the world today as a whole, L. I. Brezhnev observed, "again forcefully bears out the validity and viability of Lenin's concept of proletarian internationalism".**

However heavily many international problems may be tinged with nationalism, the CPSU and the other Communist Parties loyal to Leninism are always guided in their approach to these problems by the proposition that "in any really serious and profound political issue sides are taken according to classes, not nations"*** Marxists-Leninists

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 155.

** Ibid., Vol. 20, p. 410.

*** *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 161.

**** V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 20, p. 36.

proceed from this proposition both in their practical politics—consistently standing up for the revolutionary aims of the working class and seeking to unite all the anti-imperialist forces of our time, and in their ideological struggle, exposing the class essence of bourgeois nationalism and showing its aspirations to be incompatible with the interests of the working people.

Lenin's ideas of the class struggle and proletarian internationalism provide the key to the social content of bourgeois nationalism, in particular of its forms, which are very widespread today and which arise under the impact of modern integration processes in the capitalist world. These are denial by imperialist ideologists of the principles of national sovereignty, the extensive spread of conceptions of national nihilism, the propaganda of the supra-national ideals of "Europeanism", "Atlanticism", and so on.

However, behind these invariably lurk the chauvinistic claims of national groups of capitalists seeking to impose their hegemonistic aims on other nations. There is no doubt, for instance, that the "Europe for the Europeans" slogan, which is being put forward to counter US expansionism, has no other meaning for the West German revanchists than "Europe for the West Germans".

The current integration process, while increasing capital's potential for defence, opens up, in view of the internationalisation of the labour market and as a consequence of growing ideological and political intercourse between the national contingents of the proletariat, fresh possibilities for developing international co-operation of the working class in the fight against imperialism.

* * *

The conditions for resolving the contradiction between the social and the national appear within the framework of bourgeois development, being revealed as a tendency in the course of the socio-political and ideological proletarianisation of the "nation of working people" that is, the non-bourgeois mass of the nation. This proletarianisation means the establishment of an international community of socio-economic conditions and ideological-political aspirations of all working people, regardless of their national-ethnic or

racial origin. It is this community that is the objective basis for the formation of the working people's class outlook—proletarian internationalism.

Consequently, in virtue of its social nature proletarian internationalism gives ideological and political expression to the class unity of the national and the international in the world working-class movement. The authors of the *Manifesto of the Communist Party* proceeded from this idea when they wrote: "The working men have no country. We cannot take from them what they have not got. Since the proletariat must first of all acquire political supremacy, must rise to be the leading class of the nation, must constitute itself *the* nation, it is, so far, itself national, though not in the bourgeois sense of the word."^{*}

The opportunists tend to break the connection between the two propositions contained therein, giving each a nationalistic twist. The Leftist tub-thumpers absolutise the former ("the working men have no country"), convert it into a ringing romantic but politically absurd proclamation of national nihilism, which, however, does not prevent them from issuing chauvinistic calls so characteristic of petty-bourgeois extremists. The Rightist opportunists see any significance only in the second proposition ("the proletariat . . . must constitute itself the nation"), which they see as substantiating their doctrine of "national communism", that is, as being incompatible with the principles of proletarian internationalism.

Lenin repeatedly returned to an analysis of this passage in the *Manifesto*, stressing that it was "exceptionally incorrect"^{**} to separate the two propositions. Their true meaning is that the proletariat, rejecting the bourgeois-nationalistic idea, has to carry the working people with it in the anti-capitalist struggle, and to rise to the position of leading class within the nation so as to lead it on to socialism. Only in that sense is it "national" and only within those limits do its class interests coincide with those of the nation.

Lenin proved that the working class was to play a leading role not only in preparing and carrying out the socialist revolution, but also in the general-democratic and national liberation anti-imperialist movements. Therein lies the

^{*} Marx and Engels, *Selected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 124.

^{**} V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 35, p. 251.

tactical-strategic resolution of the problem of the "proletariat-nation", which is modified in each given country by the character of the social system, the level of socio-economic development, the balance of political forces and other concrete historical conditions.

In the conditions of the present epoch, even greater importance attaches to Lenin's propositions on the proletariat's attitude to the ideology of the national liberation movement. Lenin regarded nationalism, which constitutes the main content of this ideology, as a complex and contradictory phenomenon to which there is no uniform approach. Where bourgeois nationalism is on an upgrade, and opposes colonialism, national oppression and feudal survivals, "it is the Marxist's *bounden duty*" to support it. "But this is the limit the proletariat can go to in supporting nationalism, for beyond that begins the 'positive' activity of the *bourgeoisie* striving to *fortify* nationalism."*

At the same time, Lenin repeatedly pointed out that the Communists must tirelessly and painstakingly work to help the masses of people to free their minds of nationalism and to accept the ideas of proletarian ideology. Neglect of this demand could lead to nationalist degeneration, and a switch to the positions of petty-bourgeois pseudo-revolutionarism.

History shows that the victory of the revolution does not in itself automatically resolve the contradiction between the social and the national in the sphere of ideology and politics, and that the principles of internationalism are established in the life of the nations only as a result of long and painstaking effort by society's political vanguard.

Without leadership from the revolutionary vanguard of the working class it is also impossible to have an international resolution of the problem of the social-national relationship. Lenin saw this resolution in converting "the dictatorship of the proletariat from a national dictatorship (i.e., existing in a single country and incapable of determining world politics) into an international one (i.e., a dictatorship of the proletariat involving at least several advanced countries, and capable of exercising a decisive influence upon world politics as a whole)".**

The best confirmation of Lenin's idea of the revolutionary

* Ibid., Vol. 20, pp. 34-35.

** Ibid., Vol. 31, p. 148.

unity of the national and the international has come from its successful implementation during the October Revolution and in the subsequent activity of the CPSU. The joint struggle of the peoples of the USSR for social emancipation helped to overcome nationalistic preconceptions and mutual mistrust, producing new relations based on friendship, co-operation and mutual assistance. Elimination of the exploiting classes and establishment of social ownership of the means of production constituted the socio-economic basis for forming the Soviet people, an international entity shaped in history for the first time, which united in one state dozens of big and small nations and nationalities on the principles of complete equality, voluntary federation, and unity of purpose and interest.

Following the formation of the world socialist system, these principles were adopted as the basis of relations between the socialist countries. While the two tendencies discovered by Lenin in the development of national relations continue to operate under socialism, which has triumphed on an international scale, they lose the antagonistic character they have under capitalism and merge into a twofold process of national self-assertion and international cohesion of socialist societies. Socialist patriotism is fused with proletarian internationalism into a single whole, so that there is a fundamental change in the content of the national awareness of the peoples in the socialist countries, an awareness from which nationalist preconceptions are eliminated as the new society is built.

Socialist internationalism could have had even greater achievements but for the splitting activity of the national-opportunists, who seek to promote their selfish aims by substituting petty-bourgeois nationalism for proletarian internationalism in relations between the socialist countries, and to divide the socialist community. In view of the danger presented by such nationalistic tendencies, the Marxist-Leninist Parties loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism have engaged in day-to-day painstaking effort to improve and develop fraternal relations between the socialist countries.

The consolidation of the international unity of the socialist countries is a protracted and intricate process. The different levels of economic and socio-political development, the different historical traditions and other distinctions may

produce different interests—and this means different views—as the socialist states tackle the various concrete issues.

Consequently, there is no complete resolution of the contradiction between the socially universal and the nationally particular even under socialism, because nations continue to be divided into classes, and social property retains its nationally separate form. Such a resolution is possible only on a classless basis, that is, only under communism, when all classes disappear, when nations wither away, and mankind is organised in a world-wide communist community.

* * *

In working on the theoretical substantiation of the tactics and strategy of the socialist revolution, and implementing them in practice, Lenin warned against giving a sectarian-class and nationalistic twist to the unity of the socially universal and the nationally particular in the political line of the proletariat's revolutionary organisations. The former tendency may (ultimately) lead to a definite isolation of the working-class party, which is fraught with the risk of self-alienation from the nation's socio-political life. An equal danger is presented by the latter tendency when the proletariat's class interests are subordinated to falsely interpreted national interests, and this creates the danger of the party's nationalistic degeneration. Lenin wrote: "As long as national and state distinctions exist among peoples and countries—and these will continue to exist for a very long time to come, even after the dictatorship of the proletariat has been established on a world-wide scale—the unity of the international tactics of the communist working-class movement in all countries demands not the elimination of variety or the suppression of national distinctions (which is a pipe-dream at present), but the application of *fundamental* principles of communism (Soviet power and the dictatorship of the proletariat), which will *correctly modify* these principles in certain *particulars*, correctly adapt and apply them to national and national-state distinctions."^{*}

Any concession to bourgeois nationalism by the working-class party, any abandonment of the class view of the national problem inevitably lead to a slide down to nationalis-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, p. 92.

tic positions. There is the instructive example of the leaders of West European Social-Democracy, who adopted the "co-operation of nations" idea instead of the principles of proletarian internationalism. Very close to bourgeois-democratic ideology are also the Right-opportunist ideas of "national communism", which the imperialist ideologists regard as the most favourable medium for their notorious "strategy of building bridges" between capitalism and socialism.

Bourgeois ideologists likewise encourage idealistic distortions by "Left" opportunists and petty-bourgeois extremists, who, for all practical purposes, substitute a so-called national communism for proletarian internationalism.

The ideology which is hostile to the proletariat is prepared to make any "concessions"—to induce the proletariat, whether by persuasion or intimidation, to switch from its class attitudes to nationalistic ones, even if they are "ultra-revolutionary"; to cultivate in it a national egoism, even if it takes the form of "national communism"; to sow national dissent and mistrust within the international working-class movement, even in the form of revisionist ideas of "ideological pluralism", "polycentrism", and so on—if only communism could be transformed on nationalistic lines and "detached" from internationalism.

In the early 20th century, imperialism, with the help of the opportunist leaders of the Second International, managed to divert the Social-Democratic movement of Western Europe into a nationalistic channel and subsequently to "integrate" it with the socio-political system of bourgeois nations. Present-day imperialism seems to be trying to repeat the manoeuvre on an even larger scale, making use today of both the Right and the "Left" opportunist trends in the revolutionary movement. This appears to be pretty close to the truth, judging from the stubbornness displayed by bourgeois ideology in challenging socialism to a contest in nationalism. History shows that the Socialist who has succumbed to the nationalistic temptation does not terrify the bourgeoisie, because it is sure to win out in this contest, whether this kind of Socialist finds himself behind bars, as the German Social-Democrats did when Hitler took over, or whether, like the Labour leaders in Britain, he heads a national-reformist government.

The Marxist-Leninist Parties counter the nationalistic subversions of the imperialists and the splitting activity of

the Right and the "Left" opportunists with their internationalist line of struggle based on the ideas of scientific communism, a line that has stood the test of history in the grand revolutionary battles of the 20th century. L. I. Brezhnev says: "In their fight for unity the Communists have a tested weapon. One that has brought victory in glorious battles for the cause of the working class, for socialism. That weapon is proletarian internationalism."*

The world revolutionary movement, united at basis—the common socio-economic condition of the forces participating in it—and in purpose—abolition of imperialist rule and establishment of a just social system—is at the same time highly diverse in form of concrete historical development, which in each country is determined by the unique combination of social conditions and national specifics.

Every Marxist-Leninist Party works out and implements its own policy and tactics of the revolutionary struggle in accordance with its country's national features and historical traditions. However, the sovereignty and independence of the fraternal Parties constitute only the initial principles of the international struggle of the working class, whose common aims require co-ordination and unity of action by all the national contingents of the communist movement. Any distortion of this dialectical interconnection between the national and the international factors results in a distortion of the principles of proletarian internationalism, in national isolation, and conversion of casual differences of view into fundamental differences. Wladislaw Gomulka said at the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties in June 1969 that attitude to the principles of internationalism was the main criterion of correctness of each Communist Party's political line.

The unity of the national and the international in the struggle of the international working class is not a mechanical sum total of the revolutionary efforts of the working class in the individual countries. The Marxists-Leninists believe that this unity means that in tackling its revolutionary tasks the working class of each country gives utmost support to the world anti-imperialist movement, thereby fulfilling its internationalist duty to the international work-

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 160.

ing class. The Main Document, *Tasks at the Present Stage of the Struggle Against Imperialism and United Action of the Communist and Workers' Parties and All Anti-Imperialist Forces*, adopted at the 1969 International Meeting said: "Each Communist Party is responsible for its activity to its own working class and people and, at the same time, to the international working class. The national and international responsibilities of each Communist and Workers' Party are indivisible. Marxists-Leninists are both patriots and internationalists; they reject both national narrow-mindedness and the negation or underestimation of national interests, and the striving for hegemony."*

The communist movement is by nature internationalist, and this is most visually seen whenever the Communists meet for their forum. The June 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties was a major success in consolidating the unity of the international proletarian movement. It determined effective ways of working to strengthen the cohesion of the world communist movement and achieve unity of action by all the anti-imperialist forces. In the present complex situation in the struggle for peace, democracy and socialism, which brings together diverse forces in the fight against imperialism, the Communists, as the Moscow Meeting showed, take a concrete historical approach to the problem of combining the international and the national tasks of the working-class movement. Indeed, when tens or hundreds of thousands of representatives of the vanguard class were impelled to take part in the revolutionary movement by their instinct of defending themselves against a much stronger class enemy, the conditions of the struggle for unity were different from those of the present day, when millions are drawn into the world revolutionary movement, which has already scored a number of major victories and holds the historical initiative. However, the main thing, E. Papaioannu, General Secretary of the Progressive Party of the Working People of Cyprus, declared at the 1969 International Meeting, is that the movement has a common outlook, a common scientific view of social phenomena, a common assessment of the main political processes of this epoch, and common purposes in joint

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 37.

struggle. The theory of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, free of distortions, should serve as a granite basis for strengthening the unity of the Communist ranks. That is why the overwhelming majority of the Communist and Workers' Parties believe that any sign of bourgeois-nationalist influence within the ranks of the working-class movement inflicts serious harm on the interests of socialism and the international communist movement and hampers the cohesion of the revolutionary and the democratic forces in keeping the imperialist aggressors in check.

The epoch-making revolutions over the last half century have carried proletarian internationalism into a new phase of development. In the modern epoch, which is marked by a steady growth of the forces of socialism and democracy, a weakening of world imperialism, and a tempestuous development of the national liberation movement, the social basis of internationalism has been immensely extended, its content has been considerably deepened, new forms of its expression have emerged, and its influence on world socio-political processes has increased. At the same time, the Marxists-Leninists emphasise that consistent struggle to consolidate and develop the socialist community—the main achievement of the international working-class movement—remains central to the theory and practice of proletarian internationalism. It is of fundamental importance for all the revolutionaries of the world, Rodney Arismendi, First Secretary of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Uruguay, said at the 1969 International Meeting, to consolidate the unity of the socialist countries and to enhance the prestige of the socialist system, the Soviet Union in particular. That is an internationalist duty of the Communists, which first arose with the Great October Revolution, and which has continued to exist as the world socialist revolution continues its further advance.

This epoch makes imperative the unity of all the revolutionary forces. It is necessary both for a solution of the great tasks facing mankind, and for a solution of the tasks facing each national contingent of the revolutionary movement. The international solidarity of the working class, and stronger unity of all the revolutionary forces of our day are dictated by the need to safeguard mankind from thermonuclear war, to bring about the complete liberation of the peoples from all colonial dependence, and to carry forward

the struggle for the victory of socialism throughout the world.

The CPSU, implementing the Leninist general line, has consistently worked and continues to work to strengthen the world socialist system, and to bring about the cohesion of all the anti-imperialist forces of our day. In supporting the just struggle of the masses for national liberation and social emancipation in all continents, the Leninist Party believes that these goals can be achieved only through consistent struggle against imperialism, in close alliance with the socialist countries and the international working-class movement.

The experience of the world revolutionary movement has repeatedly borne out Lenin's ideas about the need for a close alliance and pooling of efforts by all the contingents of the international proletariat and all the streams of the worldwide revolutionary-liberation movement, which undermines and erodes the pillars of capitalism, history's last exploiting system.

Leninism has been and remains the theoretical basis for a correct combination of the national and the international tasks of the revolutionary working-class movement. This was once again unanimously reaffirmed by the 1969 world communist forum in its special address "Centenary of the Birth of Vladimir Ilyich Lenin", which said: "Today we have every justification for saying about Lenin's teaching what he himself said about Marxism: it is omnipotent, because it is true. Marxist-Leninist theory and its creative application in specific conditions permit scientific answers to be found to the questions facing all contingents of the world revolutionary movement, wherever they are active.

"Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, to this great international teaching, holds the promise of further successes of the communist movement."*

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 41.

CONCLUSION

The centenary of the birth of Lenin—a historical date of world-wide significance—was broadly marked by the international working class, the working people and progressive men all over the globe. This is fresh confirmation that Lenin was a great leader and teacher not only of the working people of Russia, but of the world's proletariat and all progressive mankind, and that Leninism is of lasting international importance.

The Address of the International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, *Centenary of the Birth of V. I. Lenin*, gives a profound and comprehensive characteristic of the epoch-making achievements of the founder of the world's first socialist state. It says: "Lenin's name has come to symbolise the victory of the Great October Revolution and those immense revolutionary advances which have radically changed the face of society on earth and signify the turning of mankind to socialism and communism.

"Lenin was an eminent man of thought who developed in every aspect the science which Marx and Engels established: dialectical materialism, political economy, the theory of the socialist revolution and the building of communist society.

"Lenin founded the Bolshevik Party, the first proletarian party of a new type, he led the world's first socialist revolution to victory and founded the first proletarian state in history, Soviet socialist democracy.

"Lenin unflinchingly fought imperialism and reaction, he upheld unity in action of all sections of the working people in battle against the common class enemy; he was a thoroughgoing internationalist, he championed equality, peace and friendship among nations, he wrathfully denounced any manifestation of racialism and chauvinism; he was the friend of all oppressed nations and opened the way to victory in the struggle against colonialism, for the people's independence and freedom, for their right to determine their own destiny."*

Those who want successfully to fight imperialism, and to realise the ideals of democracy, national independence, socialism and peace always turn to Lenin for correct and scientifically grounded answers to the most burning problems of our day, so as to tackle these problems the revolutionary way. Convincing evidence that Leninism has the truth on its side came from the victory of the Great October Socialist Revolution, the socialist revolutions in a number of countries, and the formation of the world socialist system. Today virtually any country, regardless of the level of its economic development, can throw off imperialist oppression and take the way of genuine social progress. Close alliance with the forces of international socialism is a decisive condition for the success of the people in any country. Ever broader progressive and democratic forces are joining in the world revolutionary process and the anti-imperialist movement, and this increases the diversity of the forms of transition to socialism and opens up broad prospects for new victories. Lenin's theory of socialist revolution has provided and continues to provide the key to the complex processes which determine the development of the world revolutionary movement. This is above all because it rests on the granite foundation of science and is itself an integral part of the science of society, and the regularities governing its progressive development.

History has borne out Lenin's conclusion that the proletariat is the leading revolutionary force in carrying out the epoch-making tasks of overthrowing capitalism and establishing a socialist society. Lenin's many-sided practical and theoretical activity was directed to promote the interests of

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 40.

the working class, to help it develop, invigorate its activity, and enhance its consciousness. He was consistent in his struggle to establish and carry to victory the revolutionary tendency in the working-class movement both in the national and in the international plane.

Early in his revolutionary activity Lenin wrote: "Accordingly, it is on the working class that the Social-Democrats concentrate all their attention and all their activities. When its advanced representatives have mastered the ideas of scientific socialism, the idea of the historical role of the Russian worker, when these ideas become widespread, and when stable organisations are formed among the workers to transform the workers' present sporadic economic war into conscious class struggle—then the Russian WORKER, rising at the head of all the democratic elements, will overthrow absolutism and lead the RUSSIAN PROLETARIAT (side by side with the proletariat of ALL COUNTRIES) *along the straight road of open political struggle to THE VICTORIOUS COMMUNIST REVOLUTION.*"*

The whole course of socio-historical progress in our epoch demonstrates the truth of Lenin's doctrine of the historical mission of the working class. The proletariat of Russia in fact opened the way for the triumphant communist revolution. Since then the international revolutionary movement of the working class has gone a long way in struggle and victory.

It was Lenin, the brilliant continuator of Karl Marx's cause and doctrine, who helped the international working class to rise to the central position in our age, to extend its influence in breadth and in depth, to establish the socialist system on vast expanses of the globe, and to turn the communist vanguard of the working class into the most influential political and ideological force of the modern world.

The working class is the leading class of our epoch, the vehicle and builder of the advanced social system which is supplanting capitalism. That is why its struggle for its own emancipation coincides with the interests of all mankind. It is in alliance with the peasantry, the working intelligentsia and other sections of the working people that the working class ensured the outstanding victories in creating the new, socialist, society.

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 1, p. 300.

Lenin insisted that the strength of the working class and of all the other revolutionary forces lay in their unity, in their well-knit militant alliance. Characterising the importance of proletarian internationalism, Lenin wrote: "We possess a world-wide basis, immeasurably wider than was the case in any previous revolution. We have an international alliance, an alliance which has nowhere been registered, which has never been given formal embodiment, which from the point of view of 'constitutional law' means nothing, but which, in the disintegrating capitalist world, actually means everything."*

More and more social sections are joining in the fight against imperialism as the world revolutionary process advances. At the same time, there is growing resistance from the bourgeoisie, which seeks to strengthen its international alignments to safeguard the old exploiting system. Lenin said: "Capital is an international force. To vanquish it, an international workers' alliance, an international workers' brotherhood, is needed."**

Loyalty to the Leninist principles of proletarian internationalism is a key source of the victories scored by the working class. The Communist vanguard of the proletariat (as has been shown in several chapters of this book) gives expression to the interests of ever broader masses of people. This is reflected in the development of the militant slogan of proletarian internationalism.

Let us recall that when the proletariat was still the only revolutionary anti-capitalist force, Marx and Engels put forward this slogan: "Workers of All Countries, Unite!"

As the revolutionary process developed in depth and breadth, the Communists increasingly acted as spokesmen not only for the proletarians, but also for the oppressed peoples of all countries. In the period of the general crisis of capitalism Lenin said that from the standpoint of present-day policy the Communist International was right in putting forward the slogan: "Proletarians of All Countries and Oppressed Peoples, Unite!"

Today, when the world revolutionary process has assumed even greater proportions, the June 1969 International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties proclaimed this

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 30, p. 449.

** Ibid., p. 293.

slogan: "*Peoples of the socialist countries, workers, democratic forces in the capitalist countries, newly liberated peoples and those who are oppressed, unite in a common struggle against imperialism, for peace, national liberation, social progress, democracy and socialism!*"*

Working-class unity continues to be pivotal to proletarian internationalism. The stages in the development of internationalism correspond to the main stages in world history, marking the extension of the international front of struggle against the exploiting system, and for the interests of the masses and the triumph of socialism.

Proletarian internationalism is a reliable ideological and political weapon in the struggle against nationalism, and for the militant solidarity of the working people and all other revolutionary forces.

Lenin developed a coherent doctrine of the Communist Party and put it into practice. He forged the organisational force which is capable of uniting the working class and its allies and confidently leading them to victory, a new type of party—the Communist Party—which the peoples see as embodying the wisdom, the honour and the conscience of our epoch. Leninism says that this Party's strength lies above all in the fact that it is the party of social revolution, the party of the builders of socialism and communism; that it is the most organised, class-conscious and leading contingent of the working class, equipped with a revolutionary theory; that it is deeply loyal to internationalism and is always linked with the masses. The new type of party is intolerant of any sign of opportunism or revisionism, whether Right-wing or "Left-wing". It develops and scores its successes in resolute struggle against bourgeois ideology and opportunist trends.

Emphasising the great role of the party, Lenin said: "Only the Communist Party, if it is really the vanguard of the revolutionary class, if it really comprises all the finest representatives of that class, if it consists of fully conscious and staunch Communists who have been educated and steeled by the experience of a persistent revolutionary struggle, and if it has succeeded in linking itself inseparably with the whole life of its class and, through it, with the

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 39.

whole mass of the exploited, and in completely winning the confidence of this class and this mass—only such a party is capable of leading the proletariat in a final, most ruthless, and decisive struggle against all the forces of capitalism. On the other hand, it is only under the leadership of such a party that the proletariat is capable of displaying the full might of its revolutionary onslaught, and of overcoming the inevitable apathy and occasional resistance of that small minority, the labour aristocracy, who have been corrupted by capitalism, the old trade union and co-operative leaders, etc.—only then will it be capable of displaying its full might which, because of the very economic structure of capitalist society, is infinitely greater than its proportion of the population.”*

The history of the world revolutionary movement shows how necessary and effective for the progress of all society the militant, purposeful activity of the Communist Parties is. The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, founded and tempered by Lenin, has been and continues to be a remarkable example of the new type of party. Today, there are 90 Communist and Workers’ Parties throughout the world. All the major victories in the great cause of the working class and the successes of world socialism have been achieved under the leadership of the Marxist-Leninist Parties carrying high the banner of socialist revolution.

The international communist movement is profoundly internationalist in essence. The organisational forms of the Communist Parties’ international ties have changed with the historical situation, but at every stage in the development of the world revolutionary process loyalty to internationalism has been and remains one of the most important features of the Marxist-Leninist Parties’ activity. In the present conditions, as the communist movement has declared, it is appropriate whenever necessary to hold international conferences of Communist and Workers’ Parties to discuss pressing problems, to exchange opinion, to study each others’ views and positions, and to co-ordinate various matters in the joint struggle for common goals: peace, democracy and socialism.

Every international meeting of the Communist and Workers’ Parties marked an important stage in the development of the communist movement, making a major con-

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 31, pp. 187-88.

tribution to the improvement of its strategy and tactics, and enriching Marxist-Leninist theory with new conclusions and propositions. The June 1969 International Meeting in Moscow was a resounding success in consolidating the unity of the communist and the whole international proletarian movement. The participants in the Meeting carried out important political and theoretical work, giving a profound scientific analysis of the tendencies and prospects of world development, formulating clear answers to the many burning questions agitating the Communists and all progressive men on the globe. The materials of the Meeting brought out the new phenomena in the world revolutionary movement and gave a deep analysis of the current strategy of imperialism, mapping out the ways of fighting against the common enemy in the present conditions.

It determined the main link in the struggle against imperialism—unity of world socialism and of the communist movement, and the broadest unity of action by all the anti-imperialist forces. It said: *"The existing situation demands united action of Communists and all other anti-imperialist forces so that maximum use may be made of the mounting possibilities for a broader offensive against imperialism, against the forces of reaction and war."**

The Meeting framed a concrete programme for greater unity of action by all the anti-imperialist forces. Efforts to realise it are a key condition of their unity. Taking a realistic view of the situation, the Meeting drew this fundamental conclusion: "The struggle against imperialism is a long, hard and strenuous fight. Tense class battles lie ahead and they cannot be avoided. Let us step up the offensive against imperialism and internal reaction. The revolutionary and progressive forces are certain to triumph."**

History has gone the way anticipated by Lenin: it has led towards a powerful growth of the revolutionary, anti-imperialist forces, headed by the working class, towards inevitable victory for the cause of socialism on a world-wide scale. In the struggle for the triumph of socialism Lenin's revolutionary theory has served and continues to serve as a reliable beacon. The International Meeting raised high the

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 11.

** *Ibid.*, p. 39.

banner of Marxism-Leninism and proletarian internationalism, the banner of creative development of this all-triumphant doctrine. Loyalty to Marxism-Leninism—the great internationalist doctrine—is a pledge of further success for the world communist movement. Voicing their deep faith in Lenin's cause and doctrine, the Address, *Centenary of the Birth of U. I. Lenin*, says: "The participants in this international Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties address to all Communists, to all fighters for the socialist transformation of society and to all champions of progress and peace this call for a worthy celebration of the centenary of great Lenin's birth. Study Lenin's works! There you shall find an inexhaustible fund of inspiration for struggle against reaction and oppression, for socialism and peace. Acquaintance with Lenin's works will help the rising generation to see more clearly the revolutionary prospects of our era. Spread more widely knowledge of the achievements of Leninism, of the successes of the socialist countries, Communist Parties and all revolutionary forces!

"Working people in all countries, peoples of the world!

"In the name of the triumph of Lenin's ideals, we call upon you to join actively in the great and noble battle of the working class for peace, democracy, national independence and socialism!

"Let us raise higher the banner of Leninism in the struggle for the revolutionary renewal of the world!"*

Many Communist and Workers' Parties adopted special resolutions to mark the Lenin Centenary. They set out measures for publishing, circulating and studying Lenin's writings, holding mass meetings and rallies, to mark the centenary of the birth of the leader of the international proletariat. The anniversary was broadly celebrated by all the organisations of the international working class. A resolution adopted by the Seventh World Trade Union Congress in October 1969 says that Lenin's doctrine and his revolutionary activity are of tremendous importance and are a valuable legacy of the whole international working-class movement. It adds: "Lenin devoted his life and his talents to the working people's cause, to their unity and emancipation. This explains why the centenary of his birth is being

* *International Meeting of Communist and Workers' Parties, Moscow 1969*, p. 41.

marked by working people throughout the world, who pay a tribute of respect to his memory, his doctrine and his struggle."

When preparing to mark the Lenin Centenary, the Communist and Workers' Parties determined the central tasks whose fulfilment will enable them to fulfil what he had outlined. Summing up the ideas the Communist and Workers' Parties have put forward in their resolutions, we find that the main ones are:

extensively to spread the achievements of Leninism and their highest embodiment—the successes of the Soviet Union and of the world socialist system. A resolution of the Central Committee of the Portuguese Communist Party stressed: "To mark the Lenin Centenary is to take note of the successes and victories of the Soviet Union, the main bastion of the revolutionary forces of the world, the successes and victories of Lenin's Party, the historic victories of the socialist countries, of the international proletariat, and the peoples freed from colonial oppression. It means celebrating the triumph of Marxist-Leninist ideas, which inspire millions of men and light the way of struggle for the emancipation of all mankind from imperialist oppression, and for the triumph of communism throughout the world";

to show utmost concern for consolidating the world socialist system, the main force in the struggle against imperialism, and the mainstay of all the revolutionary movements of our day. A resolution of the Central Committee of the Socialist Unity Party of Germany said: "We in the German Democratic Republic are fulfilling Lenin's precepts by building socialism as a developed social system, and improving the socialist system in all its elements and as a single whole. In the German Democratic Republic we have applied the Marxist-Leninist doctrine, which is applicable everywhere, to our concrete conditions, and have made all-round use of the experience of the CPSU and the Soviet Union";

to intensify the drive against imperialism, and to advance the cause of peace, democracy, national independence and socialism. The Third Congress of the Syrian Communist Party emphasised that "the celebrations to mark the Lenin Centenary could and should develop into a powerful demonstration of the strengthening ties of friendship between our country and the land of the great Lenin, the cradle of

socialism—the Soviet Union, between our country and other socialist countries, between our liberation movement and the world working-class movement: they can and should become a flaming torch calling to further struggle, together with the masses of poor peasants and workers, other sections of the working people and the revolutionary intelligentsia, ever greater sections of the population—men and women, young people and old, and representatives of petty bourgeoisie—who should set up a broad progressive front for the purpose of eliminating the consequences of the treacherous imperialist Israeli aggression, consolidating the socio-economic transformations and creating the necessary prerequisites for transition to socialism, for establishing Arab unity so as, together with progressive mankind, to cut short any plot by world imperialism against the peoples and their national independence, and against world peace and socialism”;

tirelessly to spread Lenin's doctrine, safeguard its purity and at the same time creatively enrich and develop it on the basis of new historical experience. The resolution of the Central Committee of the Bulgarian Communist Party says: “Lenin saw revolutionary theory not as a dogma but as a guide to action. He gave a marvellous example of how to combine revolutionary theory and revolutionary practice, and unique instances of the ability to attack and temporarily to retreat in the interests of the revolution, creatively developing the proletarian ideology and giving a positive solution to the problems set by life. For Lenin, theory threw a light on the way of practice, words and deeds blended in a harmonious whole, and communist principles were organically tied in with revolutionary flexibility.

“The essence of Leninism demands creative action in the concrete situation of each country, and development and enrichment of our theory in accordance with changing conditions. The peoples have no other ideological weapon in the struggle for the victory of socialism and communism except Marxism-Leninism”;

constantly to show concern for extending and strengthening the ranks of the Communist and Workers' Parties and the cohesion of the whole communist movement. The Thirteenth Congress of the Communist Party of Argentina declared: “The central element in the celebrations of the Lenin Centenary will be a call to the workers, peasants, young people, women, and intellectuals—to all resolute

fighters for our country's progress—to join the ranks of the Communist Party”;

to carry on a resolute struggle against bourgeois ideology and opportunism, whether coming from the Right or from the “Left”. The Presidium of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia emphasised: “The struggle to keep pure our scientific revolutionary ideology, and to oppose opportunism must become a duty of all the organs and organisations of our Party, for it is one of the main prerequisites for consolidating our political relations. . . . One of the main features of Leninism is uncompromising ideological and political struggle against Right-wing opportunism and all its forms. However, Lenin repeatedly emphasised that this struggle can never be consistent and, consequently, successful unless it is conducted against the concrete vehicles of these views. That is why he resolutely strove to purge the Party of opportunism, in general, and of its active representatives, in particular. That is the direction in which the struggle against Right-wing opportunism should be waged in our own Party”. A number of fraternal Parties also emphasised the need to struggle against “Left” opportunism.

The Communist and Workers' Parties, carrying forward on the basis of Lenin's ideas the theoretical elaboration of the pressing problems of our day, say that scientific inquiry into the working-class, democratic and national liberation movements has to play an important part in this epoch.

All the key, fundamental social problems of our day can be correctly assessed and solved only on the basis of Lenin's revolutionary legacy and with guidance from the unerring beacon—the constantly vibrant and creative doctrine of Marxism-Leninism.

It is futile on the part of Right revisionists and “Left” extremist critics of Leninism to try to prove that some of its fundamental conclusions are “incorrect” or “obsolete”, by referring to the new phenomena in social development and tempestuous technical progress under the current scientific and technological revolution, its social consequences, and so on.

Indeed, over the last few decades the face of the world has markedly changed. But the deeper the shifts in social life and the broader the scope of revolutionary changes on the globe, the greater the conviction carried by Lenin's genius

and his ideas and predictions. It was Lenin who showed how the working-class and national liberation movements were to gather strength in the epoch of imperialism. It was Leninism that had anticipated many of the features and consequences of scientific and technical development in our epoch and their importance for the international class struggle and for the competition between the two main socio-economic systems. Socialism, Lenin emphasised, requires "engineering based on the latest discoveries of modern science".* He predicted that a powerful current that flowed "from natural to social science" would remain "just as powerful, if not more so, in the twentieth century, too".**

In his creative development of the theory and practice of scientific socialism Lenin taught the Communists to master all the achievements of science and culture, and to base the policy of the revolutionary vanguard of the working class on strictly scientific principles.

Of lasting importance are Lenin's valuable directions and advice on the best lines and methods of studying the problems of the theory and history of class struggle, forms of social movements, and tendencies of the world revolutionary process. In a note about setting up an Information Institute on Questions of the International Labour Movement, Lenin proposed that this scientific centre should make a complex study of a wide range of problems—economic, social and political—bearing on the condition and the struggle of the working class.***

At the present stage of the development of the international working-class movement, vast importance attaches, in the light of Lenin's ideas on the unity of all the revolutionary forces, to the theoretical elaboration of the problems arising from the development of proletarian internationalism. In our epoch, the world-wide solidarity of the working people and of all the other fighters against imperialism acquires ever greater proportions and assumes the most diverse forms. This is due to a number of reasons, including extension of the social base of the world revolutionary process, and exacerbation on an international scale of the antagonism between imperialism and the world forces of

* V. I. Lenin, *Collected Works*, Vol. 27, p. 339.

** Ibid., Vol. 20, p. 196.

*** Ibid., Vol. 42, pp. 337-38.

socialism. The tendency towards greater international solidarity and mutual support between the working people of all countries and their organisations is being ever more pronounced.

The Leninist principles of revolutionary internationalism, which are being multiplied by the wealth of practical experience gained by the CPSU and the whole world communist movement, serve in our day as a powerful weapon in the struggle against the ideology and policy of anti-communism, and its efforts to weaken the unity of the anti-imperialist forces. These great principles have always been and will always be a guide to action for Marxists-Leninists in all countries. For the Communists, for all true revolutionaries, to honour Lenin's memory means to make a deep study of his writings, to enrich his doctrine and to be guided by his great ideas in the struggle for the revolutionary renewal of the world and establishment of a communist society.

REQUEST TO READERS

Progress Publishers would be glad to have your opinion of this book, its translation and design and any suggestions you may have for future publications.

Please send your comments to 21, Zubovsky Boulevard, Moscow, USSR.